

Antioch University AURA - Antioch University Repository and Archive

Dissertations & Theses

Student & Alumni Scholarship, including
Dissertations & Theses

2013

Applying a Leadership Framework to Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) Post Fordice

Armenta Hinton

Antioch University - PhD Program in Leadership and Change

Follow this and additional works at: <http://aura.antioch.edu/etds>



Part of the [African American Studies Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hinton, Armenta, "Applying a Leadership Framework to Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) Post Fordice" (2013). *Dissertations & Theses*. 63.
<http://aura.antioch.edu/etds/63>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Student & Alumni Scholarship, including Dissertations & Theses at AURA - Antioch University Repository and Archive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations & Theses by an authorized administrator of AURA - Antioch University Repository and Archive. For more information, please contact dpenrose@antioch.edu, wmcgrath@antioch.edu.

APPLYING A LEADERSHIP FRAMEWORK TO HISTORICALLY BLACK
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCUs) POST FORDICE

ARMENTA HINTON

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Ph.D. in Leadership and Change Program
of Antioch University
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

August, 2013

This is to certify that the Dissertation entitled:

APPLYING A LEADERSHIP FRAMEWORK TO HISTORICALLY BLACK
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCUs) POST FORDICE

prepared by

Armenta Hinton

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in Leadership and Change.

Approved by:

Lize Booysen, DBL., Chair date

Alicia Jackson, Ph.D., Committee Member date

Jon Wergin, Ph.D., Committee Member date

Mary Beth Gasman, Ph.D., External Reader date

Copyright 2013 Armenta Hinton
All rights reserved

Acknowledgments

This dissertation is the culmination of the work of a powerful collective. The journey began with a challenge from my father Mr. James Early, who looked at me and said “are you going to do it?” and my mother Ida Early who always had faith that while I danced to a different drummer, I would get there in the end. Their love and support continues to define my journey.

A tremendous thank you to Dr. Lize Booysen, my chair and cheerleader who offered me guidance and permission to be me, authentically tell my story and to value the journey. She taught me much about life and leadership, human nature, equality and social justice. I am proud to have her as an advisor and exemplar of leading change. I value every interaction we’ve shared and learned more than I can ever express.

Dr. Jon Wergin is owed a profound thanks as well. Our initial conversation convinced me that this program was exactly what I needed. Dr. Wergin’s knowledge and humility are astounding. He provided challenges when required, space for different views and opportunities to discover new ways of considering an issue.

Dr. Alicia Jackson has been an ardent supporter and sometimes a gentle critic. She is always an exemplar of grace, intellect and has taught me many lessons in integrity, perseverance and commitment. She will always have my gratitude.

Dr. Mary Beth Gasman encouraged my research and endeavors. She is a highly respected scholar in this field and her input was invaluable. I remain honored that she was a part of my process.

Thanks for the support and guidance of Dr. Linda McMillin, President L. Jay Lemons, Dr. C. Moses, Dr. S. J. Hill and other members of the Susquehanna University community.

Most importantly, thank you to my family. My patient and supportive husband Eric L. Hinton, Ph. D., HonFBC, and my wonderful children Jason Mark and Jennifer Agnes. Thank you for loving me and having faith that we could do this together!

Abstract

Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) have a list of outstanding accomplishments that span over a century; however, this segment of higher education continues to be underfunded and remains in a position of justifying its existence in a post-racial America. The issues facing HBCUs are significant. Race-based legislation has created a dual system of American higher education that adversely affects these minority serving institutions, impacting the quality of education they dispense and producing potentially negative effects on vulnerable and under-served collegians. Supreme Court Justice Thomas's opinion in the *U.S. v. Fordice* (1992) case opposed the creation of HBCUs as "enclaves for the black community," however, he also pointed out that it was unfair for HBCUs who bore the burden of segregation to now shoulder the responsibility for desegregation (United States Commission on Civil Rights, 2010, p. 43). Aided by the Delphi Technique, this study explores the effects of the *Fordice* verdict on HBCUs. By taking an historical view of policies and legislation that have affected HBCUs, I consider whether the opportunity exists for parity between Predominately White Institutions (PWIs) and HBCUs, both in educational value and resources. I also review leadership theories that could potentially be applied to HBCUs for sustainability. Utilizing a Critical Race Theory lens, I examine the history of legislation and desegregation policies that significantly influenced trends and sustainability of these colleges while providing a better understanding as to why HBCUs are in their current state. The electronic version of this Dissertation is at OhioLink ETD Center, www.ohiolink.edu/etd

Terms

HBCU—Historically Black Colleges and Universities

PWI—Predominately White Institutions

HWI—Historically White Institutions

STEM—Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics

Diversity—for the purpose of this study, diversity takes on the meaning of otherness in the context of whites being the other instead of the problematized version of Blacks being the others. This applies particularly to the diversification of Historical Black Colleges.

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Purpose of Study.....	7
Research Question.....	7
Research Positionality.....	8
Colored Positionality.....	9
Organization of Study.....	10
Limitations of Study.....	11
Chapter II: Literature Review.....	12
White Self Interest and Engineers of Black Education.....	12
Critical Race Theory and HBCUs.....	17
Whiteness as Property.....	20
Interest Convergence.....	21
Affirmative Action in Higher Education.....	25
The Myth of Meritocracy.....	28
Double Consciousness: The Effects of Whiteness as Normative.....	31
Legislation and Court Decision.....	34
Examination of U.S. v. <i>Fordice</i>	40
Challenges to Equity.....	43
Predominately White Colleges.....	46
Leadership and Change	48
Applying Leadership Framework and Difficult Dialogues.....	53

Rethinking HBCU Leadership.....	62
Summary.....	65
Chapter III: Methodology.....	67
Delphi Technique.....	68
Instrument.....	70
Panelist Selection.....	72
Data Collection.....	74
Data Analysis.....	76
Round One Data Analysis.....	76
Round Two Data Analysis.....	77
Round Three Data Analysis.....	77
Limitations of Delphi.....	78
Limitations of Study.....	78
Challenges to the Study.....	78
Ethical Considerations.....	80
Chapter IV: Data Analysis and Discussion.....	81
Response Rate.....	82
Participants of the Study.....	83
Round One.....	85
Emerging Themes of Round One.....	86
Summary of Round One Responses.....	87
Round Two.....	89

Round Three.....	92
Integration of Findings.....	95
Analysis of Responses to Question One.....	95
Analysis of Responses to Question Two.....	96
Analysis of Responses to Question Three.....	98
Discussion of Desegregation.....	99
Panelists Comments on HBCU Leadership.....	102
Summary.....	103
Chapter V: Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendation.....	104
Restatement of the Research Question.....	104
Observations Regarding Leadership.....	106
Dissonance in Delphi Study.....	109
Counter Narrative Approach.....	110
The Future.....	112
Integrative Summary.....	115
Recommendations for Future Studies.....	115
Future of HBCUs.. ..	118
Reflections and Summary.....	121
Appendix.....	123
Appendix A: Information Shared With Participants During Round I.....	124
Appendix B: Letter Sent to Panelist via Email for Round II.....	125
Appendix C: Letter Sent to Panelist via Email for Round III.....	128

Appendix D: Thank You Letter for Panelist Participating in Study.....	130
Appendix E: Responses to HBCUs Desegregation and Leadership.....	131
Appendix F: List of HBCUs by State.	148
References.....	144

List of Tables

1.1 States With Over 50% African Americans in 1870.....	14
1.2 States With Over 40% African Americans in 1870.....	14
2.1 Top 10 HBCUs.....	33
2.2 Legislation, Policies and Discussions Affecting Segregation.....	37
2.3 Legislation Discussions & Policies Post Brown Challenging Separate but Equal.....	40
2.4 Black Colleges With Highest White Enrollment.....	45
2.5 Predominately White University That Admitted African Americans.....	47
3.1 Study Participants.....	72
4.1 States Represented in the Study.....	83
4.2 Participating, Institutions Student Enrollment.....	84
4.3 Panelist List of Priorities for HBCUs.....	92
4.4 Panelists Breakdown of Disagreement.....	97

Chapter I: Introduction

Historically Black Colleges and University's (HBCUs) have contributed to the American Higher Education system for over a century; as such, their place in the annals of history is secure. A vestige of slavery and separate but equal policies, HBCUs educated the freed slave who regarded education as a key element of her liberation and citizenship. Without an education, freed slaves remain half citizens, enjoying only select rights and privileges. Once regarded as bastions of higher education for African Americans, these institution produced historic leaders, judges, scientists, musicians, teachers, doctors, and politicians. HBCUs' contribution to American society is undisputed and their significance in higher education noteworthy.

Data from the U.S. Department of Education (2007) state that HBCUs currently represent approximately 3% of colleges in the U.S. but enroll 12% of all students who identify as black or African American and produce 23% of all African American college graduates. Remarkably, this small group of colleges confers 40% of STEM and 60% of engineering degrees earned by African American students. They also educate half of the country's African American teachers and 40% of all African American health professionals.

Despite the existence of segregationist customs that severely limited the practice of inclusion and equity, HBCUs have a distinguished history of admitting students regardless of race, creed, color, gender, or national origin.

For the purpose of this study, Black Feminist theory provides the vehicle with which to examine the history and legacy of oppression in education for African Americans. Black social and feminist thought challenges mainstream scholarship and affords the latitude to incorporate analysis from an African American woman's perspective. Scholars have outlined the historical

roots of inequities in access to higher education that have existed for over a century (W. Allen & Jewel, 1995; Gasman, 2011; Wenglinisky, 1997), however, an area to be explored is whether HBCUs are anachronistic institutions born of bias that have outlived their usefulness, or institutions that have been stunted because of bad policies and limited resources but still have an important educational role to play. In examining the historical roots of HBCUs, more research should be done regarding sustainability in the 21st century. This line of research is not as prevalent in the recent canon as it provokes deep-rooted feelings highlighting historic inequities, and a potential dilution of the mission for the sake of maintaining sustainability. Further, funding bodies and decision makers in higher education appear to be reticent to take a critical view of the future and sustainability of HBCUs because of their fateful beginnings in a climate of prejudice, oppression, fear, and separate-but-equal federal policies. To discuss dismantling them or changing their focus because they function as originally designed (serving the un-served and disenfranchised) deserves further exploration.

Statement of the Problem

The struggle for equity in the United States is rife with Supreme Court decisions and legislation, which created a legacy of negative behavior and set a social tone for oppression and inequity. Following the Emancipation Proclamation in the United States, the government freed millions of former slaves and indentured servants from bondage and ownership. With this freedom came a specific set of problems, which had not been accounted for, such as giving former slaves the same and equal rights as their former owners and oppressors. Education was essential to former slaves becoming equal citizens and exercising full rights, yet the US government had not considered full integration into society and thus failed to assess the wider implications of emancipation in society. Although the freed slave had a right to an education, the

structure of educational institutions firmly placed these new citizens in a lower status than the white ruling class.

Black Codes and separate but equal legislation and policies substituted legalized slavery. As Byrd-Cichester (2000) noted, the “US government supported the racial caste system and social order that sought to continue the legacy of placing Whites in a superior and controlling position and relegate Blacks to inferior, subservient roles” (p. 12). HBCUs were thus established in a policy-making environment oriented toward educating this population without making them truly equal. HBCUs were essentially were founded and funded from a perspective of racism, oppression, exploitation, fear, and inequity. What remains in the 21st century are vestiges of a proud but unequal past, a lack of parity in funding practices, and damaging legislation. Some supporters of HBCUs believe that despite the legacy of separate but equal policies and the substantial subsequent damage, these institutions should remain a part of the dual higher education system.

Most scholarship on the creation of HBCUs is from a white majority perspective in the first 50 to 60 years of their existence. There are clear reasons for this perspective as white scholars and industrialists were the progenitors of the HBCU concept and idealogues of the Negro Problem. In his address *The Present Problem of Negro Education*, W. H. Baldwin, Jr. (1899), Trustee at Tuskegee Institute and President of the Long Island Railroad, posited that the Negro or former slave’s natural tendencies needed to be harnessed and trained in a manner that makes them useful to the New South and contributors to society through industrial education. Thirty years after emancipation, the discussion continued regarding how to harness the over 8 million freed slaves and withhold the hope of equality as providing literary education would bring former slaves closer to full citizenry. His position was, “We began at the wrong end.

Instead of educating the Negro in the lines which were open to him, he was educated out of his natural environment and the opportunities which lay immediately about him” (p. 3). This statement clearly speaks to the rhetoric of the time regarding former slaves and the approach to integrating them into society.

While numerous policies have impacted the founding and sustainability of HBCUs, a significant contributor to the complicated landscape of this cohort of higher education institutions in the 21st century is the U.S. Supreme court decision *U.S. v. Fordice* (1992). The initial case sought equality in resources between Predominately White Institutions and Historically Black Institutions reminiscent of *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954). A remedy imposed by the Supreme Courts in the settlement of the *Fordice* decision is the financial support attached to white students who wish to enroll in HBCUs in Mississippi primarily. While *Fordice*’s decision initially speaks to the Mississippi state schools, the Supreme Court’s decision ultimately affects all HBCUs and lays the foundation for all public HBCUs. The settlement does not include funding for black students to attend PWIs. While white students have other options, they have not historically attended HBCUs in large numbers; however, with financial enticements in the form of scholarships, and targeted marketing, the numbers are growing.

Critical Race Theory (CRT) scholars suggest that much like the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, *Fordice* suggested judicial measures can be viewed from a historical perspective. Generally, constitutional injuries and inequities occurred against black citizens who attended HBCUs through the dual system of education; however, while the *Fordice* decision offered benefits to the whole system, it did not address those who have been historically and most negatively impacted, namely, the black students. In fact, “Black students cannot avail themselves of the full remedy of programmatic and facility upgrades until there are enough

whites enrolled and benefiting from scholarships and other desegregation remedy funding” (Muhammad, 2009, p. 330).

There has been a steady decline in African American students attending HBCUs over the past five decades and an increase in African American students attending PWIs. Previously, the University of Mississippi and the University of Alabama created obstacles to admission for non-white applicants. These two institutions also share historic moments when their first African American students were admitted. Fifty years after James Meredith took his historic steps into the doors of Ole’ Miss (the nickname for a plantation owner’s wife), the state of Mississippi has seen an upsurge in the attendance of African American students at Predominately and Historically White Institutions in the state of Mississippi and nationally. The University of Mississippi reported 14% African American attendance in 2012. According to Fleming (1984), in the 1950s, ten years before James Meredith desegregated the University of Mississippi, nearly 80% of African Americans attending college did so at HBCUs. Today HBCUs make up 3% of colleges and universities and educate only 14% of African American collegians (Gasman, 2011). This dramatic decline could suggest that PWIs are doing a better job of educating African American students and desegregation legislation assists PWIs to increase numbers of minority students. Adversely, the increase in African American collegians attending PWIs draws from a pool of students who may have attended HBCUs. Desegregation legislation can thus be seen to have positive effects on PWIs but seemingly negative effects on HBCUs. For example, the *U.S. v. Fordice* (1992) decision addresses inequities of the American dual system and forced de jure segregationist policies. While an injection of funding to bring parity to the dual and unequal system is promised, it cannot be accessed by these minority serving institutions without sacrifice to their intended beneficiaries (Gasman & Hilton, 2012; Minor, 2005).

In *Fordice*, not unlike the *Brown* decision, the suggested remedies appear to harm the intended benefactors, the black students. White students were not necessarily the primary intended beneficiaries of the original *Fordice* and *Brown* decisions. In *Brown*, equity was sought to remedy the dual system of public education, however; what resulted was the uprooting of communities and perilous and often unwanted journeys for children to reach hostile environments of learning. Later, as diversity became the education mantra, the benefit to white children learning in a diverse context (suggesting that black students brought different life experiences to the classroom) became the soundbytes for supporting classroom and learning diversity. The impetus for *Brown* was the pursuit of equity in resources for existing black schools. However, the disadvantages to the black community were not considered. It was assumed that white was normative and in order to receive an education upgrade, black students would need to travel to white schools. As a result, many black schools were forced to close. In *Fordice*, the application of remedies indirectly benefits black students attending HBCUs as it brings with it greater resources and money to lure white students to these campuses; however, direct benefits are primarily to white students who benefit in multiple ways such as

HBCUs implementing aggressive recruitment strategies to recruit Whites, offering scholarships to Whites based on socioeconomic status, merging of nearby Black and White institutions, and closing of HBCUs. This seems calculated to use the principle of equality to bring further benefits to Whites. (Gasman & Hilton, 2012, p. 14)

This premise will be further explored in this study.

The *Fordice* decision does not appear to benefit the African American student, in fact, it advantages whites, and disadvantages those black students originally represented in the suit and the colleges that serve them. It will be difficult for HBCUs in Mississippi and other states to reach their intended desegregation or diversity targets; however, it is easily achievable by PWIs

as they currently educate the majority of African American collegians seeking bachelor's degrees.

In summary, in the mid-1800s HBCUs were established and funded in ways that made them distinct and distinctly unequal. A century later, the Civil Rights Act offered opportunities for black students to attend PWIs, which made HBCUs less viable as they served fewer members of their intended population. In efforts to remedy all de jure segregated institutions, the *Fordice* decision imposed desegregation benchmarks on HBCUs to attract more white students in order to receive funding and resources. This in turn disadvantages black students.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to establish the effects of the *Fordice* decision as set forth by the Supreme Court on HBCUs. The study will also view leadership theories that could potentially be applied to these institutions for sustainability. An historical view of policies and legislation affecting HBCUs helps to shed light on whether or not opportunities for parity exist in educational value *and* resources between HBCUs and PWIs.

Research Questions

As Critical Race Theory provides the lens that assists in the examination and linking of historical policies with contemporary social constructions of race my primary question is whether the *Fordice* decision and the inferences of interest convergence prevent HBCUs from becoming a cohort of viable institutions or relegates them to a position where they continue to struggle and justify their existence. My secondary question is: Can HBCU leadership be re-framed for sustainability in the 21st century?

Leadership of these institutions has been fraught with separate but equal policies, influencing the type of leaders that assumed governance of these colleges and universities. Some scholars have painted a grim view of HBCU leadership missteps and perceived ineptitudes highlighting crumbling infrastructures, admissions standards, financial maleficence, and leadership styles; taking notice that HBCUs were not intended to serve the majority population in their past or current state is essential to mapping future strategies for sustainability. Remembering that they were largely founded to relegate the freed slave to industrial and unequal education is crucial when plotting a new and sustainable course. Amazingly, they were able to provide useful education to many in their first 100 years; however, there can be no doubt that changes to their approach to sustainability is essential to stay in step with trends in higher education in the 21st Century.

In her recent study, Gasman (2011) presented a nuanced view of HBCUs and their leadership, positing that “scholarly and popular accounts often paint Black college presidents with a broad brush...negative characterizations embodied by words *Uncle Tom*, *Accommodationist*, *Authoritarian* have existed for more than 100 years” (p. 1). Additionally, Gasman noted that black college presidents are viewed as leaders “who place a disproportionate emphasis on power and veneer” (p. 2). Gasman’s position is that researchers should attempt to gain a deeper understanding of the characteristics of HBCU leadership in order to present a more balanced view of their approach. Therefore, in this study I explore potential opportunities to reframe leadership to accommodate the changing demographics and focus of these institutions.

Research Positionality

Reflexivity as an overarching qualitative framework is based on the idea of awareness that researchers reflect on and consider their multiple influences on research and how the

processes affect them as researchers (Gilgun, 2010). “A common way in which positional reflexivity is addressed is through race, ethnicity, class, gender, disability and sexual orientation” (Cosin, 2009). Based on my choice to utilize a CRT lens to view the historical nature of legislation and policies affecting HBCUs, reflexivity can be considered as an appropriate fit for this study and the researcher’s stance.

Colored Positionality

Critical Race Theory as used by Milner (2007) in his Race, Culture, and Researcher positionality framework is a useful analytical lens that allows one the opportunity to view research through a race-based epistemology. While this is an emerging framework, it nevertheless provides a useful tool that provides me with the opportunity to consider racial and cultural issues and deepen the researcher’s consciousness in a reflective manner. Milner posited that engaging and identifying issues of race and culture is essential to authentic research.

As outlined, the central components of Race, Culture, and Researcher, Milner (2007) embraced three of the guideposts of CRT. The first aligns with the first component of CRT, which recognizes that racism exists and is pervasive and ingrained into society. The second component is that knowledge needs to emerge from the narratives and counter narratives of people of color (Milner, 2007). For the purpose of this study, this element gives voice to oppressed groups and those most affected by the *Fordice* decision. The third component is interest convergence, which simply explained suggests that whites will tolerate advances for oppressed groups when their interest is served. In his framework Milner also suggested that there are seen and unforeseen dangers in the inquiry process: researching self, researching the self in relation to others, engaged reflection, and representation and shifting from self to system.

Milner (2007) described researching the self as the primary feature of this framework involving critical race and cultural self-reflection. The second feature involves researchers reflecting about their relationship to others. This examination and reflection also involves the notion of recognizing multiple identities and how those identities impact on one's views and the research process. There are drawbacks as researchers using this framework may find themselves representing elements of self in conflicting ways.

For example, the life world of an African American researcher may be filled with situations of racism, profiling and injustice that enable or disable the researcher's efforts to understand and to interpret the particulars of a situation with research participants in a way that is different from that of a researcher outside the group. (Milner, 2007, p. 396)

The third component of the framework is engaged reflection, which allows the researcher to consider and reflect on what is occurring within the research with race and culture as the central guideposts. The fourth and most relevant feature of the framework for this study is the requirement that researchers contextualize their personal consciousness to consider historic, political, social, economic, racial, and cultural realities on a broader scale. Taking into consideration how historical inequities have shaped my views and also the views of the research participants is an essential element to be considered. In addition, I considered the participants 'social and cultural systems' as essential element which framed the research and informed the study.

Organization of the Study

The study is divided into five chapters. Chapter I includes an introduction, statement of the problem, rationale for the study, the research questions, and limitations. Chapter II contains a review of the literature on the history of HBCUs, Critical Race Theory, and legislation and policies that have affected HBCUs. Additionally, to further understand some of the challenges to

equity in higher education as it relates to HBCUs, I use CRT as a framework to support the premise of property as whiteness and interest convergence.

Chapter II also explores potential leadership theories and frameworks that could be employed to re-frame and re-purpose these institutions for sustainability. Chapter III outlines the research approach, method, and techniques as well as process and procedures employed to achieve consensus among an HBCU expert panel by using the Delphi Technique. I used this procedure to collect information from administrators of HBCUs regarding their perception regarding the *Fordice* decision and its potential effects on their institutions. Chapter IV focuses on Data Analysis and Chapter V provides a discussion, limitations of method and procedure, summary, conclusions as well as recommendations.

Limitations of the Study

There are limitations to the lens used to conduct the study and the proposed structure as it offers a predetermination and assertions that several biases such as institutional racism exist that frame the facts and history of the study. Viewing the history of legislation both past and current that affected HBCUs through a CRT lens indicates that racism, bias, and interest convergence are present.

As the purpose of the study highlights legislation and policies leading up to the founding and sustainability of HBCUs and the impact of the desegregation legislation, the findings will not apply to all public or private HBCUs.

Chapter II: Literature Review

In this chapter, I investigate the history, founding, and sustainability of HBCUs. Essential to this process is an exploration of Critical Race Theory, Whiteness as Property, Interest Convergence, and race-based policies that have impacted HBCUs. This chapter will further explore scholarship on Anti-Affirmative Action and the history of legislation affecting HBCUs throughout their life-span. As the *Fordice* decision is the anchor for the study, an examination of the *Fordice* decision and its effects on HBCUs and PWIs will shed light on the issues. The chapter will culminate with an exploration of leadership and change scholarship, which will assist the discussion of reframing the leadership of HBCUs for future sustainability.

White Self Interest and Engineers of Black Education

Twenty years before the end of the Civil War in 1837 a Quaker philanthropist near Philadelphia started the first Historically Black College. Cheney University (formerly known as The Institute For Colored Youth) was established to train former slaves and freedmen to become teachers of other black citizens. In 1856 two more institutions were founded, Lincoln University, which was founded by a white philanthropist, and Wilberforce University, which was founded by blacks. Wilberforce was the oldest black-controlled HBCU in the nation during a time when many black institutions had white presidents, administrators, faculty, and boards of trustees (M. Brown, 2007); however, today Wilberforce (not unlike some other colleges) is experiencing declining enrollment and a crumbling infrastructure. An October 24, 2012, article by M. Pant in the *Dayton Daily News* stated that over 300 of the 489 students enrolled at Wilberforce University are threatening to withdraw from the institution because of higher tuition costs, a reduction in services, and concerns over mold in the buildings.

Following the end of the Civil War, many recognized the need to provide education to free slaves as there was a need to rebuild the South and a growing concern regarding crime and how to socialize these members of the underclass. While many well-meaning citizens, financiers, and missionaries believed in the policy of *separate but equal*, they also possessed a social conscience and assisted in the establishment of educational institutions, which were designed for and catered to freed slaves and persons of African descent.

In her report, Hill (1983) states in the Department of Education's volume on The Traditionally Black Institutions of Higher Education, 1860-1982

The Black colleges were founded and evolved in an environment unlike that of any other group of colleges—one of legal segregation and isolation from the rest of higher education. The population from which these colleges drew their students lived under severe legal, educational, economic, political, and social restrictions. The origin and development of the traditionally black institutions cannot be fully understood except in the context of the educational and socioeconomic status of the black population (p. xii).

At the close of the 19th century, a new funding source emerged for HBCUs. White Northern philanthropic support of these institutions increased primarily from the desire to control the industrial revolution and the need to provide skilled labor to its many ventures. Industrialist and millionaires such as Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Slater poured resources and funding into the new venture of educating former slaves in preparation for industrial needs and the New Order (M. Brown, 2001; Gasman & Hilton, 2012; Watkins, 2001) One such vehicle was the Slater Fund whose purpose was to educate blacks in Holy Scripture so that they would be more obedient and reverent. An additional goal of the Slater Fund was to train teachers among the former slaves and, most importantly, to provide industrial training to fuel the industrial revolution and the New South.

Industrialists, leaders, and politicians of the time were concerned about the “Negro Problem.” The overriding concern was that blacks would rise to a position of dominance, as in

many states they outnumbered the whites; however, the former slaves were largely uneducated and provided a threat should they be given the rights of full citizens including the right to vote.

“A solid Negro vote could emasculate the White South. Divine law, dictated White rule”

(Watkins, 2001, p. 176).

Educational and economic marginality and disenfranchisement of former slaves needed to be maintained. Fear existed among the white majority that providing this segment of society the right to vote would bring unknown problems. “If effective political control was to be asserted by whites, it was necessary for them to contain the political power of blacks” (Brown, 2005, p. 54). Tables 1.1 and 1.2 outline the vulnerable states with majority or large percentages of African American citizens after the Emancipation Proclamation.

Table 1.1

States With Over 50% of African Americans in 1870

<u>State</u>	<u>%</u>
Louisiana	50.1
Mississippi	54.0
South Carolina	59.0

(Source: Bureau of the Census, 1975)

Table 1.2

States With Over 40 % African Americans in 1870

<u>State</u>	<u>%</u>
Alabama	48.0
Florida	49.0
Georgia	46.0
Virginia	42.0

(Source: Bureau of the Census, 1975)

During Reconstruction a powerful segregationist J. L. M. Curry spoke out vehemently against the 13th and 14th amendments, which granted citizenship to blacks. Curry began his campaign of education and citizenship for former slaves through rhetoric based in minimalism of equal rights and access for the Negro. “He scorned those who feared that the education of the laboring classes would lift them above the station they were meant to occupy” (Watkins, 2001, p. 174).

Because the majority of whites in antebellum America believed that African Americans had sub-par intelligence, the system of segregated colleges and universities subsequently known as HBCUs educated black students in a way that taught systematic subordination under the pretense of enlightenment. Such is the case of the founding of Hampton University in 1863 by Samuel Chapman Armstrong, a son of Hawaiian missionaries. Armstrong’s efforts to assist freedmen during the Reconstruction era led him to be a proponent of training former slaves. Armstrong founded Hampton Institute to include a labor regimen, which assisted students to work in order to offset costs of their education and to socialize them to accept their place in the New South. Armstrong insisted that African Americans needed education to “alter their naturally poor character and make them capable of living among Whites”. He further suggested that they could escape their “natural penchant for laziness and move on to a better life only through the earnest benefits of labor” (Freeman, 2004, p. 6).

In a speech regarding the Negro Problem in Hartford Connecticut and Higher Education for the Negro (1900), Charles Dudley Warner posited that Negroes wanted to be educated because education was viewed as an advantage and as a sign of freedom rather than a wish for knowledge. “Negroes covet education because it had formerly been the privilege of their masters and marked a broad distinction between the races” (p. 2). Warner further suggests in his address

that the attempt to apply the same treatment for civilizing the former slave may have been miscalculated as they were more underdeveloped and less organized than other non-white races. Warner believed that the African (now the American Negro) lacked morality, good work ethic and good character. Slavery, he felt was a “necessary step in the training of the negro” (p. 7). While it was unjust and laid no foundation of morality it taught a savage race subordination and obedience. It was believed that the freed slave needed to be transformed into an industrial being.

Armstrong was not alone in his desire to educate and uplift the black masses from their plight. Many missionaries established colleges to address the belief that blacks could become a problem to white society if they were not educated and instilled with Christian teachings and values. White missionaries established colleges such as Talledega College (1867), Morehouse College in Georgia (1867) and Fisk University in Tennessee (1867).

While the first Morrill Act of 1862 provided federal support for state education and encouraged the founding of many land- grant institutions, the second Morrill Act of 1890 “mandated that those funds be extended to institutions that enrolled African Americans” (M. Brown & Ricard, 2007, p. 119). The 2nd Morrill Act makes an attempt at equity as it was a mandate of this act that each state provides education to former slaves by either allowing them to attend PWIs or by creating separate educational institutions. At this time, all Southern states, which had benefitted from slavery and some border states decided to establish separate facilities (M. Brown & Ricard, 2007).

During the decade of the first Morrill Act, politics changed from Reconstruction to the racist ideology of the Black Codes. Black Codes were laws that brazenly and unapologetically restricted the rights and civil liberties of black citizens. In her book *Understanding Everyday Racism: An Interdisciplinary Theory*, Essed (1991) stated that “racist ideology is a social

product, which has real effect only through regular patterns of action generating and articulating the ideology in, for instance governmental policy, hiring patterns, education or the formulation of academic theories” (p. 22). This premise aligns with Black Codes and Jim Crow in the United States as it embraces the central components of legalized hegemony based on racial disparity and oppression.

Jim Crow laws were established in the New South and mandated de jure segregation of races. These laws functioned at local and state levels primarily. Jim Crow led to the entrenchment of cultural practices for nearly a century and systematically oppressed and separated blacks because of believed racial inferiority. Jim Crow laws governed every aspect of southern American life including but not exclusive to education, work life, travel, socialization, voting, housing, and healthcare. Unfortunately, an intentional and lasting outcome of the misapplication of the Second Morrill Act was cementing segregationist policies and assisting states in continuing the separate but equal white supremacist policies by creating separate colleges now called Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Nearly 200 black colleges and universities were founded prior to 1890.

Critical Race Theory and HBCUs

Higher education in America has historically denied access to African Americans since its inception. “Due to enslavement and the construction of Africans as property, White privilege has been inextricably linked to African American subordination and serves as a foundation for white superiority in an oppressive educational system” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995).

In examining the history of HBCUs and how the dual system of education began, it is also essential to review legislation and policies in order to build momentum and background for the argument. For the purposes of this study, I thus outline the relevant policies and legislation

from both a historical and Critical Race Theory (CRT) perspective. Critical Race Theory lays the foundation that allows for an examination of how racist thoughts and practices, meritocracy and privilege have informed policies that have historically negatively affected minorities and specifically African Americans in higher education. “Critical Diversity (Race) Theory entails a radical look at the constructions of differences which underpin institutional culture and interpersonal interactions, and moves beyond merely tolerating or assimilating differences into dominant practices” (Booyesen, Kelly, Nkomo, & Steyn, 2007, p. 3).

Six unifying themes define the Critical Race Theory movement. CRT:

1. Recognizes that racism is endemic to American life. One must consider racial microaggressions, and other subtle slights that are a part of everyday life of a minority person.
2. Expresses skepticism toward dominant legal claims of neutrality, objectivity, colorblindness, and meritocracy. This is seen through the misapplication of diversity statements at universities, as statements and policies have become so broad and inclusive that they cover only the most egregious of behaviors that border on criminal.
3. Challenges a historicism and insists on a contextual/historical analysis of the law. Critical race theorists adopt a stance that presumes that racism has contributed to all contemporary manifestations of group advantage and disadvantage.
4. Insists on recognition of the experiential knowledge of people of color and our communities of origin in analyzing law and society.
5. Is interdisciplinary.
6. Works toward the end of eliminating racial oppression as part of the broader goal of

ending all forms of oppression. (Dixon & Rousseau, 2005, p. 9; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995).

“The CRT framework is committed to social justice in an effort to eliminate all forms of subordination of people as it asserts that race and racism should be placed in both a historical and contemporary context using interdisciplinary methods” (Gasman & Hilton, 2012, p. 2). CRT allows the exploration of other areas relating to race and education. For example emerging issues are: how do racism, sexism, classism, and other forms of subordination shape institutions of education and how do educational structures maintain race-, gender-, and class-based discrimination? In exploring these issues, it becomes apparent that diversity and affirmative action as defined by many PWIs takes on a significant meaning.

HBCUs had their beginnings at a time when it was unlawful to educate black members of society as they were considered chattel and less than human. Many policies impacting the founding, governance, and sustainability of HBCUs are historically race based and racially driven. African Americans in higher education have therefore experienced a litany of inequities, unwelcoming environments, and challenges including hegemony and racism which supported the notion that Black’s in general were subpar. This premise has tainted the notion of African American scholars and obstructed their legitimacy as educated citizens of the academy.

Following the Emancipation Proclamation and the end of the Civil War, America found itself in a situation where millions of newly declared citizens (who no longer legally belonged to other citizens) were expected to live among those who had owned, abused, and subjugated them. Education was needed for these new citizens in order for them to acculturate into their new roles as productive members of society independent of slave ownership. Here we see the beginnings of the insidious nature of separate but equal policies. The Confederacy was generally

undereducated in comparison to Northern states; however, providing education to former slaves required a new type of education. It is with great thought that one designs a system to perpetrate equality and integration while providing permanent inequality and difference. Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) served the purpose of allowing African Americans to seek and receive higher education; however, many of these institutions were focused on industrial training and were poorly funded and under resourced. Some of the institutions were private missionary-supported HBCUs with better resources than their public counterparts, however, all were by-products of separate but equal philosophy and structure.

The founding principles of HBCUs were to educate the former slave separately from the white ruling class. The CRT concept of whiteness as property and interest convergence suggest that motivators for educating the freed slave through the complicated system of limited freedoms benefitting whites and disguising the oppression of blacks will be examined in the following sections.

Whiteness as Property

Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) outlined the manifestations of the property function of whiteness in education. In schooling, the absolute right to exclude was demonstrated initially by denying blacks access to schooling altogether. Later, it was demonstrated by the creation and maintenance of separate schools. More recently it has been demonstrated by white flight and the growing insistence on vouchers, public funding of private schools, and schools of choice.

Harris (1993) posited that whiteness as a concept generally refers to property, proposing that “the core characteristic of whiteness as property is the legal legitimization of expectations of power and control that enshrine the status quo as a neutral baseline, while masking the

maintenance of white privilege and domination” (p. 1715). According to Harris, holders of whiteness have the same privileges and benefits offered to holders of other types of property.

To further examine this concept, the privilege of whiteness during slavery restricted slaves from education. This was further embedded by the use of Black Codes, which were a set of policies, laws, and codes used primarily in Southern states to control behaviors and limit the civil liberties of former slaves.

Some argue that “these institutions (specifically the public HBCU’s) were established to get millions of dollars in federal funding for the development of white land-grant institutions, to limit African American education to vocational training, and to prevent African Americans from attending white land-grant colleges” (Roebuck & Murty, 1993, p. 27). Government sanctioned funding embedded the premise of legalized and financed segregation of black and white public colleges. These colleges while funded by the same government focused on educating different races in different ways. The black colleges or HBCUs had a curricular focus on mechanical and vocational training while the white colleges had a broader liberal arts focus with substantially better resourced facilities and faculty. Whiteness as property in education gives voice and motion to white privilege as it dictates the rights to include or exclude African Americans in the educative process.

Interest Convergence

The pressure to desegregate and diversify the U.S. higher education system is unequally applied. Diversity in this context refers to white students attending HBCUs. HBCUs have remained open and welcoming to all citizens interested in receiving education, however, due to their founding and historical funding inequities, they have been unable to compete with their

white counterpart institutions. Over the past 40 years, PWIs attracted a larger percentage of black students while retaining their white culture and exclusivity.

For the exploration of the history of HBCUs and policies affecting their creation and sustainability, I employ Derrick Bell's (2005) notion of interest convergence, which suggests that the majority of whites will tolerate advances of blacks achieving racial equity when it is in the best interest of middle class whites. An example of this is the creation of HBCUs. Evans, Evans, and Evans (2002) suggest that the design and creation of HBCUs was geared toward the appeasement of blacks and created holding institutions particularly for blacks. It was not the intention of the creators of HBCUs for whites to matriculate in these inferiorly funded or resourced institutions. Further, research suggests that HBCUs were founded to train southern blacks to be productive citizens and contributors to the New South and emerging industrial age. If affording education to the newly freed slave was the ultimate goal, provisions would have been made to accommodate this cohort of newly declared citizens in existing institutions. If the goal of the government's policies had been equity, freedom, and liberty, separate inferior institutions would not have been created to educate blacks in primarily industrial training fields.

From a CRT perspective, a further example of interest convergence is the *Brown* decision. "*Brown* intended to integrate not necessarily equally educate students of color" (Yosso, Parker, Soloranzo, & Lynn, 2004, p. 12). Bell's (2005) discourse regarding integration versus equity in education was fueled by the history of the black communities that 50 years after *Brown* still find equity in education elusive. The current state of integration in education continues to place the responsibility and onus for eliminating racism on those who have historically remained subordinated and oppressed (Love, 2004). While it would be ideal to assume that diversifying and integrating education is done for the best interest of all students, education in this context

centers on white students as the standard or normative. As such, the goal of diversity in education in the context of interest convergence is tolerated as integrating classrooms with students of different backgrounds, allowing the majority student access to learn in a diverse context (Yosso et al., 2004, p. 14). In the case of the *Fordice* decision, which will be discussed in later sections, the subtext of the court's position is that HBCUs that are able to thrive will do so under forced desegregation orders, which brings additional resources and funding and assists institutions to improve the standard of education provided to all students. Nevertheless, the question remains, why were resources unavailable until the issue of equity was forced? Is it equitable to entice white students with full tuition scholarships to attend HBCUs? The bi-product will benefit all students, but the subtext could be interpreted that black students did not deserve the injection of resources in their own right. As long as HBCUs remained "minority serving," the status quo was not questioned.

The implication of interest convergence is that white people must see the benefit to them in order to support legislation and programs that support equity; an example of this is the creation of Historical Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) institutions. Bell (1987, p. 37) suggests that this premise of interest convergence dates back to the 1700's when delegates of the United States met at a convention to discuss the merits of slavery. At the convention, the majority of the delegates owned slaves and they were discussing the Articles of Confederation. Many of the delegates who opposed the importation of slaves did so not out of humanitarian motivations but because they had sufficient slaves and wanted their commodity to increase due to limited supplies. The states were divided and many who were proponents of slavery continued the appalling practice because the opposition was not universal and could be ignored. "What was lacking here is not legislative skill but the courage to recognize the evil of holding

Blacks in slavery—an evil that would be quickly and universally condemned were the subjects of bondage members of Caucasian race” (Bell, 1987, p. 37). This lack of ethical leadership continues in America through the 21st century.

Continuing this legacy of subordination in the mid 1800’s after the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, white missionary’s brought their Christian and philanthropic deeds to the oppressed Black population in the form of separate black colleges designed to expose freed slaves to an ‘equal’ educational experience. These same philanthropists offered curriculums grounded in white superiority and black subjugation. Despite their efforts of generosity and guilt, there still remained the concept and belief that African Americans were less than humans. More to the point, many of these schools were established under the guise of equality; yet, the real and hidden intention was to keep Black students from attending White schools. If freedom of choice and equity were tangibles at that time, HBCU’s would not have been required nor created.

While these institutions suffered at their inception and assisted in laying the foundation of creating for educating Blacks, they have become leaders in degree granting institutions for African Americans in higher education. If removed from the current statistics of degrees attained by Blacks, the picture regarding Black student enrollment and degrees earned would be very grim indeed.

The United States has a four-century legacy of legalized slavery with a foundation that White American’s are superior to Black Americans. Although slavery was abolished, vestiges of this oppression remain and permeate every system of our society. Understanding the effects of domination and hegemony, it remains interesting that African Americans have achieved as much

as they have in higher education especially after the creation of Black Codes and the Jim Crow racial apartheid system

“Hardly new are contemporary assertions that black deficiencies and not white racism, are the root cause of our lowly status. In the post-Reconstruction era of the 1870’s, the nation weary of racial issues, prematurely proclaimed the former slaves free and able to rise or fail on their own efforts” (Bell, 1987, p. 14). As such, the Black race suffered from legislation, cultural norms and basic inhumanity.

In education, Bell (1987) suggested that a primary motivator for the *Brown* decision was to place America in a more credible light during the Cold War as the United States was a leader in world-wide democracy. Presenting universal integrity was essential therefore, the national practice of separate but equal policies needed to be abolished. “Legislation and policy give the appearance of meritocracy and fairness in order to provide social stability and to avoid societal unrest” (Bell, 1987, p.182). Bell’s interest convergence theory suggests that most civil rights and social justice policies benefit white Americans more than black Americans. He further stated that viewing education and equity legislation through an interest convergence lens assists one to see the benefit to others.

Affirmative Action in Higher Education

In exploring issues of race and equity relating to the sustainability of HBCUs one must consider how the effects of racism, sexism, classism, and other forms of subordination shape institutions of education and how educational structures maintain race-, gender-, and class-based discrimination. Affirmative action policies and critics of these policies at PWIs take on a significant meaning if African American collegiates are to continue to pursue higher education, especially if the HBCU option becomes unviable.

In some ways the interpretation of affirmative action presents a convoluted and privileged perspective on creating diversity in colleges and universities. It is no surprise that attrition numbers are high and that some colleges struggle to retain minority students. From the perspective of the affirmative action and diversity advocates, it appears that the

unquestioned majoritarian story within this rationale is that students of color are admitted so that they can help white students become more racially tolerant, liven up class dialogue, and prepare White students for getting a job in a multicultural, global economy. (Yosso et al., 2004, p. 14)

Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, and Gurin (2002) suggested that diversity provides the process through which the presence of diverse peers affects the education of all students; however, while the benefit to majority students is articulated, the debate remains unclear as to how these diversity experiences benefit the black or minority student. Reminiscent of the previous discussion on interest convergence, diversity recruitment and affirmative action policies in higher education appear to benefit the white students in significant ways. “The goal is not necessarily to provide access and equal opportunities for students of color or to provide access to diverse groups. The assumption is that such diversity is educationally valuable to the majority” (Yosso et al., 2004, p. 14). Careful consideration should be given to affirmative action admissions programs at PWIs as they present positives and negatives. In principle the policies offer opportunities to underrepresented students who may not have been given preference in admissions to selective institutions. Alternatively, such admissions programs may well be perceived as “treating the minority admit as an ornament, a curiosity, one who brings an element of the piquant to the lives of white professors and students” (Pursley, 2003, p. 160). Statements of this nature objectify black students in unhelpful ways and are reminiscent of the “Follies and Coon Songs” that were performed for the entertainment of whites at the expense and degradation of blacks. These songs

portrayed blacks in the most negative light while purposely neglecting to highlight their positive attributes.

The privilege of whiteness in colleges and universities appears normative and whiteness is the standard. Therefore, by default, the presence of students of color is necessary in some ways only to diversify white homogeneous college campuses and thereby enrich the educational experience of its white students. While this premise may be controversial, higher education assumes that students of diversity or excluded populations should trust that the system and policies value them as equal in a system riddled with inequality.

In this study, my views align with those of Bell's (2005) view that "racial equality is, in fact, not a realistic goal" (p. 73). Bell states that African Americans and other historically excluded populations adopt a "racial realism" approach, which requires acknowledgement of subordination in a racist society. Accepting the sobering notion that racism exists in America and American culture will alleviate some of the dissonance and stressors caused by persistent racism. More effective and realistic approaches can be explored.

In the search for equity in education, one assumes that HBCUs not unlike PWIs seek excellence and hope to attract students with the ability to matriculate and graduate. Regarding Affirmative Action, the narrative is "minority preferences at PWIs serve several basic educational and societal goals. A diverse student body provides educational benefits to all students" (Bowen, Kurzweil & Tobin, 2005, p. 157). Diversifying the student body provides educational benefits for majority students as well. Further complicating the landscape of educational reform, policies and court decisions have continued to challenge the rights of African Americans in terms of rights to education.

The Myth of Meritocracy

“Affirmative Action Opponents insist that they are exclusively concerned with merit and qualifications. For some, it just does not seem possible that a black person could do anything as well or better than a white person” (Jackson-Leslie, 2001, p. 25). This premise supports whiteness as normative which measures all things in education against a backdrop of a white canvas.

Throughout the struggle for equality, Blacks in America continue to seek higher education as an equalizer to injustice and inequality, however, even after the 1954 Supreme Court decision *Brown v. Board of Education*, many African Americans still found themselves being excluded from full rights of the American citizenry such as access to education, jobs, housing and the rights to vote. A growing dissatisfaction among many of America’s Black citizens grew, especially in the Deep South where White citizens and lawmakers, resisted the Court’s order to desegregate. As such, the nation became plagued by racial tensions, which resulted in marches and riots.

The government attempted to address these growing issues of injustice through relatively weak ‘equal opportunity programs. Although Blacks have not been offered equal protection under the law during the 1600s to the mid 1900s, and were victims of legalized segregation and dehumanizing laws, codes and inequality, in 1968, President Lyndon Johnson through an executive order mandating Affirmative Action, acknowledged the dual effects of slavery, Black Codes and Jim Crow segregation and attempted to began the arduous process of reversing discrimination and inequality.

Johnson invoked the powerful metaphor of a people in chains for 350 years, or ten generations, being required to engage in a foot race with other people who were (and had

been) free of restraints. Over the years, the unchained person of course built up quite an advantage or head start. Therefore, Johnson argued in 1965 that it was not sufficient to finally unchain African Americans and declare the contest fair and even from that point. (W. Allen, Jayakumar, Griffin, Korn, & Hurtado, 2005, p. 1)

Johnson's executive order further attempted to create a less passive stance towards equality and take more progressive and aggressive steps towards equity while it attempted to undo and correct a system that encouraged accumulated disadvantages for one race and accumulated advantages for the other. It is this premise, which I posit that meritocracy cannot exist in a system that has historically disadvantaged African Americans and other minorities. To be clear, meritocracy assumes that all members of society come from the same position and advantages. Therefore, (all being equal) it suggests that merit and hard work pay off.

Many of the opponents to Johnson's legislation invoke the words of Dr. Martin Luther King. This subversive approach also encourages Black neocons such as Clarence Thomas (and others African Americans who have taken a public stance against this legislation) to support the racist actions of the white majority.

Today, as policy makers again seek to abandon civil rights enforcement, certain experts assert that the plight of Blacks is the fault of the Blacks or the social programs on which the poor rely. When such claims are expounded by Blacks, they obtain a deceptive authenticity and removes these right wing policy makers and academics from the possibility of being called racists. (Bell, 1987, p. 14)

In his book *The Exclusive Society*, Young (1999) speaks about the changes in society. He suggests that significant events changed the course of history and started a decline in 1963. While I am sure that many agree, I'd like to examine what was happening in America at that time which may have informed this premise. During this time in history, the Black Southern Negro began to quietly fight for their rights as full citizens. Rights, which had been denied to them, including equal access to education, housing, voting and healthcare. Also, in 1963, President Kennedy signed the Civil Rights Act which was met with visceral reactions and open

opposition from congress and the voting public (which was predominately White and male). Additionally, the President delivered a ground breaking Civil Rights address; Martin Luther King delivered his I Have a Dream Speech at the foot of the Lincoln Memorial; Sam Cook and his band were arrested for trying to register in a 'White's Only' hotel and later recorded the song 'A Change is Gonna Come', James Meredith becomes the first Black person to graduate from the University of Mississippi and lastly, the President of the United States was assassinated. Could Wilson's premise of the decline of society, pinpointed to the exact year, suggest unharnessed privilege as this premise indicates to me that once Blacks began to position themselves as equal citizens through governmental assistance and legislation, the unknowns and balance of what was expected in society no longer existed. Young (1999) posited that threatening what has become normative can potentially lead to fear and dissonance. Some of this fear can be interpreted as crystalizing through an anti affirmative action stance.

Imagine, if you will, those who support meritocracy and the narratives that are shared in particular from White immigrants. The notion that hard work and dedication can assist you to transition from rags to riches in America is well known. Yet, one does not consider the racist underpinnings of our society and how opportunities are withheld or thwarted due to a system of oppression and subjugation to the White dominant group.

Jackson-Leslie outlines in her article *Race, Sex and Meritocracy* (2001) a premise which captures the spirit of white male privilege in American society and takes the conversation from implied racialized subtext. She posits that governments, colleges and organizations should not need to rely on external scrutiny in order to enact policies and implore systems to disguise unequal treatment. Also, she reveals that if the system has traditionally been weighted to give

white men an unfair advantage, their superiority is fragile as they make and adjust rules to suit their circumstance in hopes of keeping the balance of power within their grasp.

In order to understand some of the challenges to equity in Higher Education, for the purpose of this study, I view Critical Race Theory as a foundation in which it allows for an examination of how racists thoughts and practices, meritocracy and privilege have informed policies that have historically negatively affected minority and specifically African Americans in higher education.

Double Consciousness: The Effects of Whiteness as Normative

The privilege of whiteness in colleges and universities appears normative and whiteness is the standard. Therefore, by default, the presence of students of color is necessary in some ways only to diversify white homogeneous college campuses and to thereby enrich the educational experience of its white students. While this premise may be controversial, higher education assumes that students of diversity or excluded populations trust that the system and policies value them as equal in and system riddled with inequality.

In education, integration in its current state continues to place the responsibility and onus for eliminating racism on those who have historically and continuously remain subordinated and oppressed (Love, 2004). While it would be ideal to assume that diversifying and integrating education is done for the best interest of all students, White students are still the standard or normative students.

One must consider the lasting and horrifying effects of facing each action and each day with under the blanket of inferiority and making it your life's work to either disprove the stereotypes or embrace them. Indeed, the development and direction of the historically black colleges and universities depended greatly on the status of the black population and dynamic of

African-American society. The larger historical events, too constantly affected the development of the HBCUs (Lovett, 2011, p. 1)

White as normative has effects on the black psyche. It plays a substantial role in how one functions or finds ones place in the academy or the world. Viewing the founding of HBCUs from a critical race view and examining the effects of sustaining an often times admirable yet separate education, the black academic and administrator has few choices than to view white as superior and black (or themselves as inferior). Du Bois premise of double consciousness as interpreted by Yancy (2004) states “whiteness is the axiological standard against which all nonwhites are to be judged and assessed. Du Bois also recognizes the flexibility of whiteness how certain people (such as European immigrants) can become white” (p.13).

Using this premise of blackness as bad and whiteness as good, there will be larger implications to HBCUs in relation to their perception of self and place in the academy, both consciously and unconsciously. HBCUs serve a problematized group. Encouraging white attendance cleans up the stigma and makes the institutions meet the standard of whiteness as normative to encourage white students to attend. This precept is further ingrained in the process as funding incentivizes the metaphorical sterilization and bleaching of the HBCUs.

The system of whiteness as normative is further ingrained in how America reports on its colleges. In a widely used and published scale and rankings of American universities, one sees the disparity. According to the *U.S. News and World Report* University Rankings for 2012-13, the top HBCUs are listed in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1

Top 10 HBCU's

<u>HBCU</u>	<u>Type of Institution</u>	<u>National/Regional Ranking</u>
Spellman College	Private	62 National Liberal Arts
Howard University	Public	115 National Universities
Morehouse University	Private	127 National Liberal Arts
Hampton University	Private	29 Regional Liberal Arts/South
Fisk University	Private	144 National Liberal Arts
Tuskegee University	Private	17 Regional Liberal Arts/South
Xavier University	Private	17 Regional Liberal Arts/South
Claflin University	Private	178 National Liberal Arts
Dillard University	Public	Rank not published
Florida A & M University	Public	Rank not published

U.S. News and World Report University Rankings for 2012-13, Top HBCUs

The most prestigious HBCUs are not closely ranked with PWI's. While I am not comparing the top 10 HBCUs to the Top 10 Liberal Arts or National Universities (but should be able to) there is a significant gap between HBCU rankings and similar PWIs. What does this say for equality in education since this small number of colleges continue to educate and confer large

percentages of degrees granted to African American students? Further, it is troubling that there are separate rankings for HBCUs. According to the U.S. News and World Reports College Rankings 2011 it states:

These historically black colleges and universities (HBCU) were compared only with one another for these rankings. In order to be on the list, a school currently must be designated by the U.S. Department of Education as an HBCU. To qualify for the U.S. News ranking, an HBCU also must be an undergraduate baccalaureate-granting institution that enrolls primarily first-year, first-time students and must have been a school that was currently part of the 2011 Best Colleges rankings. (Historically Black Colleges and Universities College Rankings, 2011)

To see the inconsistency in comparators, the white list of colleges states that number 17 nationally is Vanderbilt University, however on the HBCU list, number 17 is Clark Atlanta. In all fairness, these two institutions are not on par and it would be unfair to compare them, however, these are the vestiges of a dual and unequal system. Making the assumption that college rankings outwardly are not based on race, but because they are compared only to each other they are based on one can surmise that the institutions below the top 5% provide lesser standards and it is unlikely that they will ever be on par with PWIs. Brining these colleges up to standard will require new strategies and funding. As HBCUs educate 18% of Black college students, it is unacceptable to allow them to remain underfunded which promotes a system of inequality.

In the study, I reveal the effects of the double consciousness within the black academy. How the disparate views and competing agendas play out in informative yet disheartening ways. Yet, much is revealed through commentary and what administrators believe are priorities.

Legislation and Court Decisions

Racism has deep roots in American society. The history of minorities (specifically blacks) in higher education in America is steeped in a tradition of the country's hegemonic

structure, in which the ideals of inequality and unworthiness of African Americans as educated citizens is embedded. Such an attitude accounts for the general questioning as to whether there was a need for further or higher education among this particular citizenry. Historically, African Americans were considered less than human and treated as chattel, therefore the rights of citizenship as outlined by the fathers of the U.S. democracy did not consider the rights of the slaves that many of them owned (Byrd-Cichester, 2000).

Numerous policies and court decisions paved the journey to the 21st century HBCU and the existing dual system of education. The *Dred Scott* (1867) decision addressed the issue whether people of African descent were in fact to be protected under the constitution of the United States. In 1857 the Supreme Court decided that African Americans were not intended to be accommodated by the framers of the Constitution. Further legislation and court cases embedded hegemony and oppression such as *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) one of the nation's most insidious court rulings stating that separate facilities are equal, which ingrained a constitutionalized regime of separateness.

Bell (1987) posited that during the post Reconstruction era, the United States government prematurely proclaimed the former slaves free without thought to the ramifications and responsibilities of freedom. As such, the black race suffered from unfettered racist legislation, cultural norms, and basic inhuman treatment.

To offset the hardships placed on the freed slaves adjusting to their new freedoms, the federal government established the Freedmen's Bureau to assist former slaves by providing food, clothing, job placement, educational facilities, and land (Blaustein & Zangrando, 1991). The government assisted the Freeman's Bureau to support the founding of many small HBCUs (Gasman & Hilton, 2012). As a direct result of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), many of the nation's

minority citizens sought education at great risk and cost to themselves and their families. While the first Morrill Act of 1862 assisted in establishing public institutions that provided practical agricultural and mechanical education, it did not dictate racial parity; however, the second Morrill Act of 1890 mandated that funds for education be distributed equitably to both black and white service institutions.

The Hatch Act of 1887 followed the establishment of small higher education institutions for former slaves. Gasman and Hilton (2012) suggest that the Hatch Act aided agricultural programs established at land grant institutions. Through this act the government called for equal application of funds and resources between white and black colleges unless specifically directed by individual states to do otherwise. This appears to have been another case for “state’s rights.” At this point, Southern states decided not to equitably distribute funding and resources between black and white institutions. Although the Hatch Act specifically protected funding for equal distribution to white and black institutions, the funding did not reach black colleges as it was funneled instead to white colleges that benefited and served white middle- and upper-class students (Gasman & Hilton, 2012).

Although *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) solidified separate education and facilities for blacks and garnered much support in the creation of a new oppressive society, following the *Plessy* decision, several challenges to Jim Crow would continue to plague the judicial system. Table 2.1 outlines landmark policies and legislation affecting the journey of segregation in the United States from the mid-1860s.

Table 2.2

Legislation, Policies, and Decisions Affecting Segregation

<u>Case or Policy</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
Freeman's Bureau	1865	Assisted with jobs and educational facilities for freed slaves. Also assisted in the creation of some HBCUs
Hatch Act	1887	Suggested equal financial support for black and white institutions. Distribution was guided by the states
Morrill Act	1890	Supported the establishment and embedded the separate but equal status
Plessy v. Ferguson	1896	Court decision which upheld separate but equal provisions in the US (Gasman & Hilton, 2012)

The United States education system remained plagued by the dual system of education that embedded inequity.

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, segregation emerged as the dominant system to manage the substandard nature of blacks. The South fought to keep slavery, and lost, then it tried the Black Codes and lost. Then it looked around for something else and found segregation. (K. Brown, 2005, p. 54)

Brown v. Board of Education (1954) would be a landmark case that declared separate but equal in schools is unconstitutional. According to Alexander (2012) the *Brown* decision was a significant indicator that the old ways of the South in terms of race based actions and thinking would end and discrimination would no longer be legal. She further stated:

in 1956, Southern white opposition to desegregation mushroomed into a vicious backlash. In Congress, North Carolina senator Sam Ervin, Jr. drafted a racist polemic "the Southern Manifesto," which vowed to fight to maintain Jim Crow by all legal means....Just as Southern legislatures passed Black Codes in response to Reconstruction,

nearly fifty new Jim Crow laws were passed in response to *Brown v. Board* in five Southern legislatures. (p. 37)

Dixson and Rousseau (2005) noted that Critical Race theorists have described the *Brown v. Board of Education* as a “magnificent mirage—an example of unfulfilled hopes for racial reform” (p. 18), as it appears that rather than bringing about social justice and equity in the educational experiences of African American students, it managed to restructure the mechanisms of racism.

Some scholarship suggests that the *Brown v. Board* decision came at a time of international disapproval of American’s racial and oppressive practices (Gasman & Hilton, 2012), however, Driver (2011) posited that disapproval has not historically been a sufficient condition to result in an alteration of American practices, noting “It is possible that the court found Jim Crow laws and practices to be an international embarrassment because it clashed with interests in justice and equality” (p. 170).

During decades of violence and insurrection from the white majority, the Civil Rights Movement with the support and assistance of the Supreme Court helped to change American segregationist policies. Nearly a decade following an upsurge in racial violence and reinvigorated White Citizens Councils, which were established to uphold Jim Crow past and present, the Black College and University Act was enacted with the definition of a historically black college and university as one that existed before 1964 with a historic and contemporary mission of educating blacks while being open to all (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2010). Subsequently, *The Higher Education Act of 1965* allowed HBCUs to have funding from the federal government. Funding would be earmarked for colleges that served low-income students.

Adams v. Richardson of 1973 and the *HBCU Acts* would ensure that HBCUs would be considered an important part of the higher education system. Finally, the fight for equity in

higher education seems to have run for over 140 years and for the purpose of this study ends with the landmark case originally filed in 1975, *U.S. v. Fordice* (1992), which declared that all of higher education must desegregate and that individual states must eliminate all segregation. While the decision mandated that all homogenous educational institutions needed to educationally justify or eliminate all vestiges of segregation, including HBCUs (Wenglinsky, 1997), this legislation has led to white students attending HBCUs at increased rates. “The *Adams v. Richardson* and *U.S. v. Fordice* cases stand as the judicial examples for desegregation in those states that historically operated racially segregated dual systems of higher education” (M. Brown, 2001, p. 50). For example, the *U.S. v. Fordice* (1992) decision addressed inequities of the American dual system and forced de jure segregationist policies. While an injection of funding to bring parity to the dual and unequal system is promised, it cannot be accessed by these minority serving institutions without sacrifice to their intended beneficiaries (Gasman, 2011; Minor, 2005), a point that will be further explored in this study.

The current body of research does not define whether integration of these institutions is necessary to their survival or how well it is being applied. What is noted is that an increased number of non-black, traditional students are attending HBCUs in the United States (Gasman, 2011; Muhammad, 2009; Wenglinsky, 1997).

Table 2.3 outlines policies that challenged the dual system of education and separate but equal policies.

Table 2.3

Legislation, Decisions, and Policies Post Brown challenging Separate but Equal

<u>Legislation</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Decision</u>
Brown v. Board of Education	1954	Supreme Court decision declaring separate but equal is unconstitutional. This remains central to the discussion of desegregation of HBCUs.
Adams v. Richardson	1973	U.S. Department of Education ordered to enforce Title IV of the Civil Rights Act in higher education. 19 states were in violation.
United States v. Fordice	1992	U.S. Supreme Court decision stating that Mississippi must eliminate all vestiges of de jure segregation.
Knight v. Alabama	1991	Alabama State courts held that many of the state's policies fostered segregation in Alabama's colleges. (Gasman & Hilton, 2012)

Examination of *U.S. v. Fordice*

The *U.S. v. Fordice* case was primarily brought for equity in funding and resources. Jake Ayers, an African American, sought equal accommodations and resources as the PWIs in the state offered greater opportunities and educational accessibility than the Historically Black options. Ayers was a parent of a “Jackson State University student, and filed his case in 1997 claiming Mississippi had, for decades, under-funded its three black public universities” (Lovett, 2011, p. 250). “In *Fordice*, the Supreme Court acknowledged that Mississippi had handicapped its HBCUs, as compared to their historically white land-[grant counterparts, by systematically

allocating fewer resources to these institutions and supporting fewer professional programs at them” (Sum, Light, & King, 2004, p. 482).

It appears that the state of Mississippi and other former slave states had embedded systems of segregation in education, which were a direct result of state’s rights, Black Codes, and Jim Crow. *Fordice* attempted to dismantle these systems by creating solutions to desegregate and create “race-neutral” remedies, which do not take into account the legacy of the hegemonic structures that created HBCUs at their inception.

In the *Fordice* ruling, the U.S. Supreme Court identified four policies traceable to de jure segregation. The first was the American College Testing (ACT) program, which allowed admissions to state colleges based on these scores. Blacks traditionally did not perform well on this test, which gave the impression that the policy was created out of discriminatory intent. Another issue was classification of PWIs as flagship universities, which implied greater levels of funding. A third was the duplication of programs at PWIs that existed at HBCUs. These provisions were set up for white students with the understanding that the HBCU would be unable to compete with the teaching and level of resources. Therefore, the PWI would duplicate an educational program that is offered at a state-funded HBCU. This further embedded the segregation and intentional discrimination of funding. The fourth and final policy identified was the inequitable funding between PWIs and HBCUs (Hebel, 2004).

Compliance with the *Fordice* decision will assist many states with enhancing resources and funding. Some states have claimed that there is ambiguity regarding what constitutes compliance with *Fordice* (Brown, 2001). In his study of desegregation in higher education Brown (2001) further states that

The Courts have established the doctrine of requiring states to take reasonable steps to eliminate policies and practices that are traceable to the prior dual system. It is this ambiguity that prevents states from establishing and attaining achievable compliance goals. (p. 53)

In many ways, compliance with *Fordice* (some believe) would eliminate program duplication and close the funding gap and disparities between the two types of institutions. However, *Fordice*'s remedies are finite. Minor (2005) suggested that once payments are made or benchmarks are met, the funding is concluded. Also, as state budgets are set, it is up to governors and legislators to interpret and initiate their individual de-segregation plans. Given the lack of federal oversight, this could be reminiscent of the pitfalls of "states' rights" and the 14th amendment.

As the premise of interest convergence suggests that Whites have historically maintained their dominance over minorities through power, privileges, laws and policies and will allow advancements to minorities when it benefits the white majority (Bell, 1987; Gasman & Hilton, 2012), examining the corrective measure put forth in *Fordice* through this lens reveals several points.

Initially, much like the *Brown* decision, CRT scholars suggest that the judicial measures for *Fordice* can be viewed from a historical perspective. Generally, constitutional injuries and inequities occurred against black citizens who attended HBCUs through the dual system of education; however, while the *Fordice* decision offered benefits to the whole system, it did not address those who have been historically and most negatively impacted, namely, the black students. In fact Muhammad (2009) suggested that Black students would not benefit from upgrades or enhanced resources resulting from the remedies of *Fordice* until white student enrollment had been increased.

Another remedy suggested in the settlement is the financial support attached to white students who wish to enroll in HBCUs in Mississippi. While the *Fordice* decision primarily spoke to the Mississippi state schools, the Supreme Court's ruling ultimately affected all HBCUs and laid the foundation for all public HBCUs. Yet the settlement does not include funding for black students to PWIs. While white students have other options, they have not historically attended HBCUs in large numbers; however, with financial enticements in the form of scholarships, and targeted marketing, the numbers are growing (Gasman & Hilton, 2012).

Racial integration remains an important ideal, worthy of pursuit; however, it should not be pursued blindly. Bribing whites to attend black colleges privileges whites and discriminates against blacks. Attractiveness to whites is not an appropriate measure of an institution's value, especially given the persistence of white racism. Black colleges are the survivors rather than the discriminatory effect of the history of state-enforced segregation. They are part of the remedy for the lack of black educational opportunity, not a harm to be cured. (O'Brien, 1999, p. 50)

Challenges to Equity

The legacy of inequitable funding is a significant challenge facing HBCUs today. Lum (2001) posited that the average per-student allocation of state appropriated funds in the fiscal year 2001 was \$6,064 at public HBCUs compared to \$10,266 at public PWIs. She further noted that difficulties with recruiting leadership exacerbates such funding disadvantages. The pool of candidates for HBCU leadership is comprised of higher education executives and leaders who are primarily African Americans dedicated to the mission of minority serving institutions. This limits the selection process and collective from which to choose.

Enrollment in public higher education institutions in 19 states at HBCUs is approximately 16% of all blacks who enroll in higher education. HBCUs have a 3% share of the total higher education market. Therefore, they educate a significant portion of the nation's African American collegians.

Despite their history of inadequate resources and underfunding, HBCUs continue to produce graduates who are major contributors to higher education in the United States. Nevertheless, faculty salaries remain lower, infrastructure is not as robust as other institutions, accreditation issues persist with some HBCUs, and they continue to be disproportionately worse off fiscally when compared to their white counterparts (Brown, 2007).

Six regional associations govern the accreditation process. Since black colleges are predominately situated in the South, most HBCUs are governed by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) for their accreditation and official endorsement. As one can imagine, the SACS has been criticized for its disproportionate attention to HBCUs and public sanctions of institutions under their purview.

According to Gasman, Baez, and Turner (2008), “A unique burden of historical discrimination and inequity that HBCUs face is inequity in funding with respect to their white counterparts” (p. 6). Gasman et al. further stated that shared governance offers particular challenges to HBCUs for various reasons such as committee make-up, lack of faculty senates, less racial homogeneity, which leads in some cases to less cohesion, and a cultural constraint that prevents minority faculty from speaking out against a black president or senior administrator as they do not wish to bring credibility to stereotypes.

Lovett (2011) suggested that a significant problem among these colleges is the “state practice of giving PWIs better resources and duplicative programs that rivaled those at nearby public HBCUs. This is an externally imposed problem that impeded the expansion of graduate offerings and efforts to attract more non-black enrollments” (p. 283).

Perna (2001) posited that despite the relative concentration of black students in higher education in the South, problems persist with race equity, institutional resources, and opportunity

within the public higher education sector in Southern states particularly. Some research suggests that the enforcement of Title IV (which prohibits programs or activities that receive federal funds from discriminating on the basis of race, color, or national origin), remains challenging as some states passively or actively resist compliance. Even though many states have made progress, there still remain substantial inequities in enrollment and bachelor's degrees granted to African American students at PWIs. Additional research is required to understand the ways in which civil rights enforcement has continued to shape race equity in public higher education in many states.

The lack of accountability in relation to equity is evident in outcomes. Harvey and Anderson (2005) reported that college completion rates are lower for blacks than for whites. Once enrolled, one in three whites (34%) between the ages of 18 and 24 completed four or more years of college, compared to (17%) of blacks.

Many HBCUs have made attempts over the past decade to desegregate. Some did so out of re-invention and survival, and others complied with federal mandates. In Table 2.4 I outline a list of HBCUs and their representative non-black student enrollment.

Table 2.4

Black Colleges With Highest White Enrollments

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Percentage of White Enrollment</u>
Bluefield State College (W.Va.)	89
West Virginia State University	83
Shelton State Community College (AL)	65
Lincoln University (Mo.)	64
J.F. Drake State Technical College (AL)	47
Kentucky State University	35
Bishop State Comm. College (AL)	33
Saint Philips College (TX)	31
Langston University (OK)	23

Elizabeth City State University (NC)	22
Tennessee State University	21
Fayetteville State University (NC)	20
Trenholm State Technical College (AL)	20
Delaware State University	18
University of Maryland-Eastern Shore	18
Harris-Stowe State College (MO)	17
Shaw University (NC)	13
University of the District of Columbia	11
Bowie State University (MD)	8
Alabama State University	6
Norfolk State University (VA)	6
Southern University at New Orleans	6

(M. Brown & Ricard, 2007)

Predominately White Private Colleges

The primary focus of this study is the history and sustainability of HBCUs whose founding principles were to provide education to former slaves and other disenfranchised communities. While their focus has changed with time, it should be noted that there was a significant cadre of private colleges who provided early education to black Americans prior to reconstruction. “The matriculation of black students at some of the biracial religious (private) colleges affected the development of HBCUs as they educated Black Americans that became the faculty members of the early black schools and colleges” (Lovett, 2011, p. 6).

Many of these colleges have admitted black students since their founding, while others that were influenced by legislation and the anti-slavery movement began to admit and educate black students as well. One of the many influences on support for the education of former slaves was Horace Mann’s Common School Movement, which was established to support the education of black citizens. Mann argued that education saved citizens from poverty and vice and prepared

them for the adequate performance of their social and civic duties. It should be noted that this is a small sampling of the colleges that admitted and matriculated Negroes. Table 2.5 shows the first PWIs to admit and educate African Americans in the 18th and 19th century.

Table 2.5

Predominately White Universities That Admitted African Americans

College	Year	Admissions Policy for AA
Dartmouth College	Founded in 1789	Admitted students regardless of color
The Western Reserve College	Founded in 1826	Admitted black students in 1830s
Antioch College	Founded in 1852 on principles of social justice	Admitted black students since its founding in 1852
Harvard University	Founded in 1636	Admitted black students in 1848

Research has suggested over the years that racial diversity is being achieved on college campuses, however, the definition of diversity and what it includes varies from campus to campus.

A comparison of a recent profile of almost any college or university in the mid-twentieth century, the contrast would be striking. Instead of de jure segregation, one would find racial/ethnic diversity that has increased to the point where nationally, nearly one-third of the study body is comprised of students of color. (Clayton-Pedersen, Parker, Smith, Moreno, & Teraguchi, 2009, p. 1)

The trend indicates that some institutions are accepting more students, staff, and faculty of diverse backgrounds, including those who identify with invisible diversity (such as the LGBT community). Engaging higher numbers of minority students, staff and faculty implies that organizations and colleges are intentionally removing barriers to engagement and marginalization. While this case has not been made in higher education at Predominately White Institutions (PWIs), it is clear that institutional diversity, campus climate, social interactions, and

the general environment are relevant and essential elements of creating an inclusive and affirming environment for students of marginalized or minority status. This is being achieved by both HBCUs and some PWIs.

The challenges to diversity at HBCUs are unique as their creation was not intended for a multicultural student body. New and effective methods of leadership and governance will be essential to sustainability. In the following sections, I will explore leadership and change theories that could ideally be applied to successfully transition these institutions through sustainable and positive change.

Leadership and Change

Leadership of a university presents daunting challenges even under normal circumstances. In the wake of the *Fordice* decision, however, it is even more critical that leaders promptly pursue remedies to certain challenges in order for institutions to keep much desired resources and funding brought by diverse students.

In order for HBCUs to succeed in the face of the many internal and external challenges they face, they will need to reframe their purpose and leadership in a manner that includes an understanding of the political influences affecting change within the dual system of higher education. Higher education research and change theory generally provide frameworks for creating new directions for effective change within colleges and universities. Few theories take into account the barriers and resistance factors created by changing racial identity and the progressive diluting of cultural norms. Desegregation legislation such as *Fordice* adds layers of resistance to change and places HBCUs in positions of vulnerability if they do not achieve benchmarks in term of non-black students. Higher education institutions are unique and change management and theories should be adapted to these organizations. I explored leadership

principles as a potential framework for sustainability of these institutions while considering the political strategies that could be useful and effective in overcoming some of the resistors and barriers to change.

In the application of the change process it is essential that stakeholders understand the proposed change. One of the primary resistors to change is when people have no understanding or appreciation for the reasons that the change needs to occur or the benefit to them and the organization (Eckel & Kezar, 2003).

Bolman and Deal (1991) identified four main guideposts for leaders to consider when effecting change: mapping the political terrain, coalition building and developing advocates and allies, bargaining, and negotiating. While these elements are useful, having an understanding of the political terrain and political motivators, such as an unwillingness to relinquish historic legacies, will be most effective in influencing change at HBCUs. Kezar (2001) stated that because college environments are extremely political, mapping power structures and identifying influential stakeholders are essential to institutional change.

Transformational leadership theory (Burns, 1978) is a useful framework for examining my subject because effecting deep or major change often requires fundamental alterations in how campuses identify and operate. In the case of HBCUs, transformational change could potentially alter their identity and will require cultural shifts and changes to their missions.

While Burns' ideas of leadership presume that leaders have positions of formal authority, his perspective is also from a majority and privileged position. Assuming that followers are similar could present flaws in application. An interpretation of Burn's theory suggests that one should develop a vision and translate the vision into action; however, one's ethics and beliefs will guide the vision. The application of *Fordice* correctives affects the vision of HBCUs.

Burns (1978) defines transformational leadership as a process in which leaders and followers engage in a mutual effort to raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation. Through this process, leaders are able to appeal to the ethics, values, and ideals of their followers by modeling the behaviors and values they wish to advance. Northouse (2001) suggests that transformational leadership also involves satisfying the needs and acknowledging the values of followers.

Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) expanded on concepts of the ethics of leadership by outlining the three pillars considered essential to being an ethical leader. Ethical leadership is comprised of (a) the moral character of the leader; (b) ethical values embedded in the leader's vision; (c) the leader's morality, which must be injected into the process of social and ethical choice in a manner that engages the followers collectively (Burns, 1978, p. 182). Generally, Ethical leadership in the context of HBCUs contributes by its very nature to promotion of education diversity because of its emphasis on inclusion. Some HBCUs are investigating methods of transformational leadership to instill institutional values that promote wider inclusion. Such efforts must take into account certain potential obstacles, such as stakeholders concerns about how deeper changes to the current environment will negatively affect them in terms of what levels of resources they must share or relinquish for the sake of equity. This concern can be seen among institutions that award full financial scholarships and incentives to white students to attend HBCUs when they are unable to offer black students equal funding.

Burns (1978) asserted that morality is central to leadership. While some scholars may not agree that morality is essential in transformational leadership, it is clear that morality should guide leaders' principles and visions. Sendjaya (2005) pointed to Lee Iaccoca as an example of amoral leadership in the sense that he is viewed as an inspiring yet unethical leader. Although

Iacocca supported the growth and development of new models and organizational empowerment in the Chrysler Corporation, under his leadership the company began the production of a car with major flaws in safety requirements that could lead to death from burning that nevertheless became a forerunner in sales and successfully created a new market. The organization's leadership decided to continue manufacturing the cars after a cost-benefit analysis was performed showing that it was less costly to pay damages for injuries or deaths than to change the model and design of the car. This decision to continue manufacturing an unsafe yet lucrative car weighed financial gain and profit versus loss against morality with profit ultimately prevailing. Despite the associated costs of loss of human life or dismemberment, Iaccoca is considered a transformational and inspirational leader who turned a failing organization into a profitable leader of innovation. It is useful to translate such ethical dilemmas in leadership within the context of the decisions HBCU leaders will have to make to adhere to *Fordice*, particularly with respect the inevitable costs of achieving parity of funding for the promotion of diversity.

Applying transformational leadership and change management in higher education to achieve inclusion and diversity requires awareness of political, economic, moral, and ethical drivers behind desegregation and leadership. Cuilla (1995) proposed that in order for one to be considered an effective and superior leader, the leadership style must include both technical competencies and moral capacities. Applying technical aspects of leadership to higher education is simple, while the political, moral, and ethical factors in leadership are subjective. This is further complicated by the unintentional results of *Fordice*. Burns (1978) suggested that followers act on what they think they want, and not necessarily what they need. Transformational leadership theory therefore assumes that leaders "are distinguished by their ability of not

necessarily responding to the wants of followers but to wants transformed into needs” (Burns, 1978, p. 69). Transformational leadership and change can be applied to the desegregation of HBCUs as the want and desire to be better resourced and provide equitable educational opportunities aligns with the need to aggressively recruit white students in order to receive promised funding.

There are two key success factors for influencing real and tangible change: understanding the need for change and the belief that the change is both desirable and possible. A process of learning new ways of leading is essential to establishing a viable action plan for making diversity a part of the fabric of the institution and not an add-on. Establishing motivators and incentives for diversity as well as methods for sustaining it will make the process of change more effective.

As stated by Burns (2004), the process of leadership for the sake of establishing institutional diversity should raise the institution to a higher level of motivation and morality. It should further raise awareness and consciousness in a manner that will ultimately lead to a new way of being for the university. First, the leadership must examine its commitment to changing the level of thinking regarding diversity on the campus. In order to achieve this, it is essential for senior level administrators to explore and clarify their beliefs and goals regarding diversity. If diversity is essential to the growth and sustainability of the institution, the leadership must inspire the community to outline their vision, and excite others to the level of buy-in; however, diversity initiatives at HBCUs as a result of the remedies of *Fordice* present a unique set of political and community challenges. Kezar (2008) suggested that understanding the dynamics of politics involves appreciating the way people define their concerns and how they use power and strategies to assert their interests. One might view *Fordice* remedies as creating a diverse and less homogeneous environment on HBCU and PWI campuses, however, the full scope of the

challenges of desegregation to HBCUs has not yet been addressed widely in leadership and change or higher education leadership literature.

Kezar (2008) indicated that diversity initiatives in higher education have broad goals that include understanding diversity, attention to difference, and equity and parity in the experiences of students, staff, and faculty of diverse backgrounds. The diversity initiatives that affect HBCUs directly relate to welcoming and resourcing non-black students, staff, and faculty in an environment that was not originally designed for these at the institutional level.

Applying Leadership Framework and Difficult Dialogues

In this section of the dissertation I outline a historical perspective of HBCU leadership and legislature affecting their sustainability. The current literature on the subject indicates that these presidents appear to contend with forces that negatively affect their governance such as external influences, policies, and politics rooted in racism and bias that adversely affect how they deliver quality education to their students. While the scholarship on HBCU presidents and leadership has been damning, it should be noted that not all HBCU presidents fall into this troubling category. “Policymakers, researchers, and funders should look at the actions of individual Black college presidents as just that—the actions of individual Black college presidents” (Gasman, 2011, p. 28). HBCU college presidents should place pressure on their individual states to fulfill their commitment to the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) of the U.S. Department of Education to make these colleges comparable to those of their white peers, enabling them to attract more non-minority students (Palmer, Davis, & Gasman, 2011). Governmental and funding bodies’ full commitment to righting previous wrongs is required, regardless of how difficult. This corrective can potentially take several new directions that may be unpopular among stakeholders, such as merging state institutions or “similar” institutions to

avoid duplication of funding and programs. What is clear is that HBCUs cannot remain as they are.

The White House has focused more attention on the survival of these historic institutions since 2008. This support has come in the form of re-establishing the White House Initiative on HBCUs, a significant injection of funding, and including HBCUs in the healthcare bill, which will assist these colleges to a tune of \$850 million. One understands that these gestures, while significant, will only help the institutions if they are held accountable and if the leadership is robust. Unfortunately, in the case of some HBCU institutions there is much work to be done. Though these institutions educate our most needy and disenfranchised Americans, they are expected to do so with weaker leadership infrastructures and frameworks. Lack of funding and resources is no excuse for poor decision making, poor leadership, and poor governance.

Despite documented evidence that underfunding is a reality under which HBCUs must function, effective governance and leadership is attainable. While leaders of these institutions have historically managed within a racialized context, best practice remains essential to effectively educate their students. One cannot examine the future of HBCUs without reviewing their past, including positives and negatives.

Evans et al. (2002) posited that whereas some HBCUs seem to struggle because of poor leadership, not all HBCUs suffer from problems in leadership. It is safe to assume that college presidents should be aware of issues surrounding academic enterprise, management, finances, personnel administration, information systems, and planning yet HBCU leaders face extraordinary challenges.

While not under the same circumstances as HBCUs, leadership has effectively transformed institutions throughout history; for example, institutions that serve women have

been challenged by legislation forcing them to reframe their purpose as it was believed that single-sex colleges such as Radcliff violated the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution. As Harvard College, the all-male sibling to Radcliff, became co-educational, Radcliff ceased to have a unique market on educating Harvard's female students. Women who chose Radcliff or other selective women's colleges did so as they preferred to be educated at single-sex institutions. Radcliff quickly recognized that their original and intended market of being the educators of undergraduate women at Harvard had changed, as Harvard was now a viable coeducational option. The merger allowed Radcliff to re-purpose its identity for future shared sustainability. A different set of challenges exists in the case of HBCUs and desegregation as women's colleges such as the 7 Sisters were well funded and not created from fear and hegemony. Nevertheless, such examples offer useful lessons about how to re-frame and re-purpose for sustainability.

“As late as the 1960s, HBCUs as a group suffered from stereotypes of presidents who rode in limousines and lived in mansions while their colleges verged on the brink of fiscal disaster” (Wagner & Smith, 1993, p. 40). While this view of mis-appropriation suggests that these presidents are unprepared for the fiscal responsibility of leading institutions and paints them as fiscally irresponsible, mean-spirited dictators, and pimp-like caricatures who take financial advantage of their positions by misusing funding and maintaining poorly managed institutions, it bears saying that this stereotype does not represent all HBCU presidents and leadership.

Scholars such as Gasman have effectively stated the positives of HBCUs, their accomplishments, history, and challenges. Meyerson and Scully's (1995) “tempered radical” approach privileges Gasman in ways that could prevent difficult conversations about race and ineffective leadership. Meyerson et al., depicted tempered radicals as leaders who are cultural

insiders generally considered a part of the dominant culture, yet do not share the values and views of the majority. These leaders (in this instance white women) make systemic changes from within. Because they are close to the center of power and privilege, their methods can be more stealth and less obvious. According to Meyerson (2003), “tempered radicals reflect important aspects of leadership that are absent in more traditional portraits. It is leadership that tends to be less visible, less coordinated, and less vested with formal authority” (p. 173). Changing the topography of the dual system of education requires difficult dialogues, which are occurring with less frequency. An example of Meyerson and Scully’s (1995) tempered radical theory is illustrated in her article “How to Paint a Better Portrait of HBCUs,” in which she quotes a 2010 *Wall Street Journal* Op-ed piece by Jason Riley:

In September 2010, Jason L. Riley, an op-ed writer and member of the editorial board for the *Wall Street Journal*, took aim at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) in an article titled “Black Colleges Need a New Mission.” He wrote, “When segregation was legal, black colleges were responsible for almost all black collegians. Today, nearly 90 percent of black students spurn such schools, and the available evidence shows that, in the main, these students are better off exercising their non-HBCU options. (p. 1)

Riley (2010) is not incorrect in his statement that a large percentage of African American students choose to attend PWIs instead of HBCUs. While the reasons behind this are beyond the scope of my study, the topic nevertheless presents significant opportunities for future scholarship. Presently, the reasons for this are complex and there is not simply one answer as to why African American students are choosing PWIs over HBCUs on such a scale. Gasman (2011) suggested that Riley used outdated information and disparaged HBCUs, not just claiming that they needed a new mission but also questioning their very existence.

He compared them with Ivy League institutions, which, of course, have much larger endowments and are much more selective than the average college or university. He referred to research from the 1960s by Harvard sociologists Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, who had barely set foot on a black college campus, in describing the current climate at HBCUs. He also used *U.S. News & World Report* rankings—which,

because they are based largely on endowments, securing of grants, selectivity, and alumni giving, privilege wealthy research institutions—to make judgments about the quality of education provided by HBCUs. (p. 1)

While I agree with Gasman in part, I also feel that Riley's statement has some validity.

Riley's (2010) referral to Jencks and Riesman, while difficult to accept, hits hot button issues.

The prevailing argument is whether these colleges (which in some ways are considered third rate and less than competitive with the exception of their top 5%) should reframe their purpose and mission in order to offer the best options in higher education for their students. They should also meet the needs of students equally as PWIs. Rather than cling to institutional and political history to explain and defend their deficits, leaders should look realistically at ways in which these deficits can be addressed. Unfortunately, these types of difficult conversations are not occurring widely.

Stone, Patton, and Heen (1999) asserted that all difficult conversations share three structures: a) factual, b) emotional, and c) meaning. In launching the necessary conversations about racist historic practices, the values of each individual state's department of education, or funding structures within governments, leaders should evaluate achievement statistics and facts regarding persistence rates and policies, which make these colleges viable and competitive. A more difficult element of this conversation would be to ensure that representatives from HBCUs do not insert the historic race-based failures of government into conversations regarding sustainability. While it is essential to understand the inequities of how unfair funding policies have become embedded, is it in the best interest of HBCU leaders to look forward in determining how policies can be altered to change the forecast of their institutions.

As mentioned previously, conversations regarding the leadership and history of these institutions are fraught with emotion in part because HBCUs have been under resourced from

their inception and designed to primarily educate and train the freed slave. The origins of HBCUs were rooted in the white majority's emphasis on relegating blacks to industrial or vocational education, which would advance the labor force and enhance the focus of white industrialists and agriculturalists. Keeping this in mind, current legislation seeks to remove inequities, even if the suggested remedies offer little benefit to the historically injured and more benefit to the white potential and existing students.

Stone et al. (1999) also suggested that meaning in conflict touches on one's identity and reflects who we are separately and together, implying that we bring our multiple identities, beliefs, and cultures to each interaction and conflict. Whereas historical funding inequities have historically existed between HBCUs and PWIs, solutions proposed by the courts and the government in some instances can present additional challenges to HBCUs. For instance, requiring HBCUs to desegregate and aiding that effort by affording scholarships to non-black students sets up power systems within the student body that could send a negative message to the black students who have not been afforded full tuition scholarships. The current research also indicates that while HBCUs are not being held to the same standard as PWIs, their existence is being questioned. More viable solutions will only be attainable when legislators, HBCU administrators, and funding bodies are able to have honest yet difficult conversations about HBCUs that recognize the ills of the past while also attempting to set these institutions on a solid path of sustainability.

To acknowledge past inequities and move beyond the racialized experiences that have contributed to inequities in higher education, scholars and HBCU leaders must adopt a non-racialized stance that holds the education of the student as a priority regardless of racial, ethnic, and cultural perceptions. This, along with focusing on the education of the vulnerable student

populations that HBCUs serve and providing them with an equitable and useful college experience, would prove that guilt and fear of being considered racists is no longer central to useful strategies for sustainability. To the contrary, effective change comes from difficult decisions. It is no longer acceptable to hide behind the past when plotting a course for the education of underserved and disenfranchised students. Scholars that continue to cite previous inequities without proposed solutions provide excuses or shields behind which legislators can cower. In her essay “Is Reconciliation Possible,” Batts (n.d.) introduced the concept of dysfunctional rescuing as a form of modern racism characterized by “helping people of color based on an assumption that they cannot help themselves, setting them up to fail; this help is often motivated out of guilt or shame” (p. 11). Government officials that do not hold HBCUs to standards that are equal to those governing PWIs jeopardize the education of black students and set these students down a path to receive less than competitive education in some instances. Batts (n.d.) stated:

Modern racism may be manifested by not understanding or denying the differential impacts of social, political, economic, historical, and psychological realities on the lives of people of color and whites, minimizing the influence of such variables on all our lives and institutions. This modern racism may be accompanied by an attitude that cultural differences are just interesting or fun. Such a stance results in an unwillingness to acknowledge the multiplicity of ways in which the impacts of the myth of white superiority continue. (p. 21)

HBCUs have been held to a different standard and subjected to policies that keep them separate and not as competitive as their PWI counterparts. This can be seen in the example of the troubling case of a top rated HBCU president who fired over 70 employees of whom a large percentage were tenured faculty. He did this in the middle of an academic term and without due process and seemed to receive no sanctions from governing bodies or state funders. It is unlikely that a similar PWI would be allowed to continue to govern in this manner.

American demographics are changing, specifically in Southern states, which house the majority of HBCUs. According to a March 2011 article in the *Atlanta Business Chronicle* the black population in Georgia rose 25.6 percent and the Hispanic population spiked 96.1 percent since. Such statistics suggest that leaders of HBCUs should reframe their position in order to accommodate changes in potential student enrollment. Scholars such as Perna (2001) and Minor (2005) suggested that with a burgeoning minority population, it is the responsibility of states to make these institutions comparable if they want to have highly skilled and educated citizens to lead the state's economy. Minor (2005) further asserted that the rationale for HBCUs is no longer a racialized effort to effect equity and social justice and correct past discriminations. Rather, HBCUs can now be seen to meet a public need by producing educated citizens who contribute to the advancement of their communities (Minor, 2005). This appears to be a familiar argument; as previously mentioned, anti-slavery movement leader Horace Mann, founder of the Common School Movement, argued in 1832 that education saved citizens from poverty and vice and prepared them for the adequate performance of their social and civic duties (Lovett, 2011).

In order to provide genuine equity and access to quality higher education, leaders will need to be courageous enough to have difficult conversations and make unpopular decisions. Among these difficult conversations is one that addresses the fact that many students who chose to attend HBCUs did so because of their lack of preparedness for competitive institutions; for example HBCUs' efforts to offer remediation courses that bring students up to standards are significant. While HBCUs have a proven record of investing in students to bring them up to college level work, their graduation rates continue to lag behind their PWI counterparts. Because HBCU students present typically have a high financial need and are less prepared for college,

they take out loans at a higher rate and are going into debt to earn a degree, yet many are not succeeding to graduation.

In an article by an associated press reported, which appeared in USA Today exploring the low graduation rates of black men at HBCUs, Philander Smith College's former president Dr. Kimbrough weighed in on the issue of remediation and resources for the most needy students attending HBCUs, stating, "HBCUs nor any college should admit students if they don't have the resources they need to get them through. It is immoral to admit someone when the indicators suggest this person will not graduate" (Pope, 2009). To solve this problem, HBCUs could institute 5-6 year degree programs, which would accommodate the 1-2 years of remediation often required to meet the needs of this vulnerable and unprepared student body.

Lovett (2011) summarized Secretary Duncan's comments at the 2009 HBCU conference's White House Initiative on HBCUs as follows:

One of the biggest problems facing HBCUs is that students entering these colleges receive an inadequate education in high school and arrive with poorer skills. HBCUs need more funding to be successful and to turn out the next generation of African American teachers to serve in high-poverty urban and rural schools. (p. 282)

Although the White House has continued the legacy of giving special attention to HBCUs through a Presidential Task Force, many government agencies dispensing funding and imposing restrictions on underperforming HBCUs are headed by white bureaucrats, while most HBCUs are led by black presidents and administrators. There is thus a racial context to conversations regarding sustainability of these colleges. Bergsieker, Shelton, and Richeson (2010) posited that communication concerns for whites and minorities in interracial interactions differ. Whites are more concerned about appearing prejudiced, whereas minorities are fearful of becoming the target of prejudice and/or appearing incompetent.

Given extensive evidence of divergent experiences in interracial interactions, it follows logically that Whites and minorities' impressions and management goals may also differ, and these contrasting goals may in turn contribute to this pattern of divergent experiences in interracial interactions. (Bergsieker, et al., 2010, p. 261)

Bolman and Deal (2003) suggested that re-framing can be useful in helping leaders navigate difficult terrain, stating that "A good frame makes it easier to know what you are up against and what you can do about it" (p. 13). Nevertheless, it is still necessary for the leaders of HBCUs to accept that their image has suffered and sustainability is threatened. Leaders must reevaluate their approaches in order to reframe their experiences in a manner that allows them to find the most effective solutions. Because the conversations and strategies surrounding HBCUs are fraught with sensitivities and racialized subtexts, reframing their purpose and leadership is essential to their sustainability. According to Wergin (2007),

It's time we rethink how our colleges and universities are organized and led. While political pressure for greater accountability has been the chief catalyst for change, other forces for change have huge implications for academic leadership. (p. 5)

Re-Thinking HBCUs Leadership

Academic leaders create learning environments that include cultural awareness, acceptance of multiple intelligences and ways of knowing, strategic thinking, engagement, and a sense of collective identity as collaborators in developing knowledge and active investigators into practice. They are skilled facilitators who encourage interdisciplinary collaboration, collective responsibility, cultural change, and an interest in the public good. They lead via partnerships and teams in systems that are web-like and non-hierarchical. And in an era of heightened accountability, the culture of evidence is critical to successful academic leadership. (Amey, 2006, p. 55)

The aforementioned statements are common to all academic leadership, and are particularly relevant in America's dual system of institutions serving both majority and minority populations. Throughout the process of researching HBCUs, I have noted there are few reports in educational journals or periodicals that speak to their leadership successes. Much of what is published is sensational or highlights underachievement or the egregious behaviors of the

administration, thus making generalizations about all HBCUs. Other contributions to the canon of research focus on poor funding, resource inequities, historical legislation, and male underachievement (W. Allen & Jewel, 1995; M. Brown, 2001; Gasman & Hilton, 2012; Minor, 2005; Wenglinsky, 1999). My study potentially offers considerations and contributions to the lack of research on potential leadership options for HBCUs.

HBCUs are in a difficult place as there is an indelible footprint and context of racism within which they operate with respect to their founding and sustainability. They hold a unique place in higher education, yet, they are understudied and under resourced. Leaders of HBCUs are living in “psychic prisons because they cannot look at old problems in a new light and attack old challenges with different more powerful tools—they cannot reframe” (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 4).

The challenges of HBCU leadership regarding change management and diversity requires many steps and an understanding of the organizational culture. Tierney (1988) stated that an appreciation of organizational culture will improve the performance and systems of the organization and aid administrators in identifying conflicts and managing change more effectively. Having an understanding of the organizational culture and cultural pride associated with HBCUs is essential to garnering support of stakeholders in the necessary change required for sustainability and the achievement of desegregation benchmarks. Kezar (2008) suggested that scenarios surrounding diversity on college campuses are political and noted that there is little research examining how leaders address the politics and culture surrounding these sensitive and sometimes volatile issues. Kezar’s research centers on higher education widely with some focus on low income and underrepresented students, however, an application of her findings could be useful in reframing HBCUs for the future. While research has assisted in outlining strategies for

PWI campuses to adopt and implement diversity, an area for development could be research that identifies a framework for HBCUs to adopt and implement diversity or to outline and overcome barriers to achievement of diversity. This could be especially useful if the strategy addresses issues relating to the resistance and resentment experienced by leaders of HBCUs as their experiences are steeped in a tradition of less-than and separate and unequal.

In his book, *Leadership in Place* (2007) Wergin offered a leadership solution by suggesting that leadership in place as a concept “is having the opportunity, the ability and the courage to sense the need for leadership in the moment, then seizing that opportunity” (p. 224). He further stated, “it is time we rethink how our colleges and universities are organized and led” (p. 15). In the case of some HBCUs, managerial thinking and leadership should be enriched to affirm the past experiences, learn what has worked, adapt to new ways of leadership and seize leadership opportunities for future sustainability. This applies to those who hold leadership positions within the institution and those who do not.

Additional challenges to stability at HBCUs are frequent changes and difficulties with leadership. Gregory (2003) reported that the administrative cultures of HBCUs are vertical or top down rather than horizontal or bottom up. One of the most urgent challenges facing HBCUs is the need to create more supportive work environments. Turnover rates among faculty and presidents are increasing at HBCUs where they have been linked to the financial crisis, enrollment declines, and low faculty morale (Gregory, 2003). Wergin (2007) cited contributor Willis Watt as stating “we must empower others to understand who they are and what they hope to achieve—personally and professionally. Empowerment frees people to act” (p. 230). Should the principles of *Leadership in Place* be applied, HBCUs might realize greater cohesion and faculty and staff satisfaction, which could reduce issues of low morale and high turnover.

Whitchurch (2008) suggested that one way to address the changing needs of contemporary college environments is evident among successful institutions that are managing the complexities of blurred boundaries between professional and academic areas. This entailed redefining professional identities in order to assist in managing procedures inflicted on colleges by outside bureaucracy such as the dictates of the *Fordice* decision. Viewing sustainability challenges and changes to HBCUs through a lens of shifting identities empowers faculty and staff to work collaboratively to cope with ongoing demands on the institution.

As previously noted, there is a general perception in the literature that many HBCU presidents lead from an authoritarian framework and that community input or governance is neither solicited nor desired; however, if the proposed change is for the benefit of the education of the student, leaders should be able to establish a process to communicate their vision and outline the steps needed to achieve it. “The function of leadership becomes the creation of systems, structures and environments where interaction and learning can occur” (K. Allen, et al., 1998). This concept may cause conflict; however, dialogue and input is essential to carefully considering perceptions of workers and their perceived value to the organization.

Initiating institutional change always creates conflict and presents challenges. In the case of HBCUs, however, realignment of roles and relationships with a view toward institutional change is essential to meeting the needs of 21st century post-secondary education.

Summary

In this chapter I highlight relevant literature covering the beginnings of HBCUs. Utilizing a Critical Race Theory framework, I explore the motivation of the progenitors of the HBCU system, a history of legislation affecting HBCUs, challenges to equity, and potential leadership frameworks to facilitate change. The *Fordice* decision and a history of legislation supporting and

disassembling segregation in higher education are examined through a survey of the extant literature within this study. This review shed light on the fact that there are clear challenges to leaders of HBCUs and the future of these institutions as well as sustainability in terms of maintaining the purity of their original mission and recruiting other race students at high percentages. Most literature outlining concerns in terms of HBCUs creation and sustainability does not offer leadership and change theory, which could be applied to facilitate impending and necessary changes. An examination of current scholarship within the canon suggests that some HBCUs are less than equipped for the challenges faced in 21st-century higher education. Crumbling infrastructures, under-resourced libraries, and under-funded faculty positions, all of which prevent further research are some of the challenges faced by these institutions as a result of a century of inequities.

Fordice's attempts to remedy these former inequities through desegregation have become problematic for some institutions. Desegregation guidelines and legislation influencing institutional changes are attached to resources for recruitment of other race students. HBCUs face specific issues in relation to a dilution of culture and racial identity, which can be an intractable resistor to change. Future studies should include an exploration of the cultures of HBCUs as well as racial, ethnic, and cultural identity as resisters to change.

Chapter III: Methodology

This chapter outlines the research approach, method, and techniques as well as process and procedures employed to obtain information using the Delphi Technique. McMillian and Wergin (1998) suggested that research is systematic, rigorous, and empirical observing that “educational research is a systematic investigation, involving the analysis of information (data) to answer a question or contribute to our knowledge about an educational theory or practice” (p. 1). Additionally, because some of the findings of this study may be unpopular and much of the data will be from narratives and interpretations at this juncture, recognition and control of bias is essential. In this study, I utilize qualitative methods.

In preparation for this study, I collected data and information from archival sources and summary data. Further, I explored current and past scholarship on HBCUs dating from the late 19th century to present day. I also reviewed archived journals, newspaper articles, monographs, and statistical data from government sources. This line of enquiry was useful and further pointed to the conversation about the Negro Problem several years after the Reconstruction as indicators of the motivation for the creation of HBCUs.

Qualitative research utilizes detailed narratives and descriptions and can be organic in nature as the researcher gathers information and can re-frame the design as the research unfolds. This study utilizes the Delphi Technique, which is a qualitative method. The method was used in order to gain a purposeful consensus of experts and are directly or indirectly affected by the *Fordice* remedies of desegregation. The study’s findings will relate to the HBCUs represented by the panelists.

The Delphi Method

Initially developed by the Rand Corporation in the 1950s this technique is a method that is “useful for achieving consensus of opinion using real-world knowledge solicited from experts within certain topic areas” (Hsu & Sandford, 2007). The Delphi Technique is a widely used method for gathering data from experts using a series of questionnaires delivered by multiple iterations to collect data from a panel of selected subjects (Hsu & Sanford, 2007). This approach was chosen for its simplicity and ability to reach a consensus and discovering common threads of concern to HBCUs as a result of the *Fordice* decision and remedies. In addition, as the Delphi Technique can be executed within a short period of time, this method will be useful to this proposed study. Like many qualitative inquiry methods, the Delphi approach focuses on understanding and describing the lived experiences of people who have experienced a similar phenomenon or been exposed to a common set of conditions (Creswell, 2007).

Turoff and Hiltz (1996) explained the four objectives or goals for Delphi exercises as: exploring or exposing underlying assumptions that could lead to differing judgments; seeking information that generates consensus; correlating informed judgment on a topic spanning a wide array of disciplines, and educating the experts as to the interrelated aspects of the topic.

One of the primary characteristics of this technique is the ability to provide anonymity to respondents while reaching a consensus (Dalkey, 1972; Hsu & Sandford, 2007). Given the nature of perceived leadership and difficulties that are faced by the panelists, this technique appears to be most suitable.

For the purpose of this study, I used a heterogeneous group which consisted of panelists who possessed expertise and knowledge of the topic of HBCUs but had a focus in different professional groups, i.e., Deans, VP's, Directors. Clayton (1997) suggests that panel size ranges depending on the constitution of the group. When using a heterogeneous group consisting of people with expertise in a particular topic but coming from different stratifications like deans, enrollment directors of HBCUs only 5 to 10 experts are needed on the panel. If the study had used a more homogeneous group such as only deans from the same area, or professors from the same discipline the appropriate group size would have been 15 to 30. There has been little agreement in the scholarship dictating panel size or a consistent correlation between sample size and effectiveness of the study. In some literature, it is acceptable to have panel sizes of 6 to 12 members (Hogarth, 1978; Mitchell, 1991).

Particularly for this study it was necessary to gain a view of institutional impact of desegregation legislation and policies as well as perceived challenges to leadership. Ensuring that the views came from experts who had different access points to student engagement, policy, recruitment and retention strengthens the findings of the study as panelists originating from a heterogeneous group who have different investments and priorities but all share expertise in the subject.

The criticisms of Delphi suggest that the method lacks structure in determining expert knowledge. Panelist in this study, while not all from the same discipline or rank within the academy, held specific and expert knowledge of the impacts of desegregation effects of the *Fordice* remedies and leadership challenges. Of the criticism of Delphi, Gordon's (1994) position of the use of Delphi further supports the use of this methodology for this study. He

outlines that in Delphi the numbers can be small and studies that utilize this method are not generally intended to produce statistically significant results; however they serve as a synthesis of opinions of a particular group. Additionally, these results do not necessarily reflect the response of a larger group or population. Therefore, the contribution of this study to the research of HBCUs may be useful in isolating specific areas of consensus that apply to the participating institutions while they may not apply globally to all minority serving institutions or HBCUs. The study's results highlight areas of concern which scholarship supports and could generate future research and development.

The Delphi process is continuously iterated until a consensus among the expert panelists has been reached. Three iterations are generally sufficient to collect the data required to confirm consensus. In the first round, an open-ended questionnaire is presented to each expert panelist. After receiving the responses, the researcher converts the collected information into a well-structured questionnaire, which serves as the survey instrument for the second round (Hsu & Sanford, 2007).

The following section outlines the questions and the process for each round.

Instrument

The questions were selected from extant literature and experts in the HBCU field. The questions were open-ended and for the purpose of this study were targeted to effectively answer the research question.

Round I. In the first round of the questionnaire I identified issues to be addressed in later rounds and developed questions from the extant literature in consultation with experts in higher education, including leaders of institutions in Southern states who are directly affected by the *Fordice* decision.

Open-ended questions increase the richness of the data collected (Powell, 2003). To collect the data, I identified administrators that met my criteria and contacted a variety of staff at HBCUs via email and telephone. Initially, recommendations from deans at colleges or other colleagues in the network of HBCUs recommended panelists to participate in the study. The first round of questions were open-ended in keeping with the Delphi process, however, they served as the guideposts for soliciting further information about the perceived effects of desegregation on HBCUs as a result of *Fordice*.

The questions were:

- What, if anything, is your institution doing to encourage desegregation?
- How might institutional leadership affect desegregation?
- What are the major challenges facing HBCUs regarding desegregation legislation, funding, and policy changes?

As the study utilized Delphi it allowed anonymity and security. Answers and interactions were anonymous, which encouraged openness and authenticity from the respondents.

Round II. In the second round the expert panelists received a summary of their answers from all panelists. They were asked to review the answers and, stimulated by what others said, add any additional thoughts that they felt addressed the questions as they related to their specific institutions. This information was sent via email with an accompanying letter. Follow-up emails were sent and phone calls were made to ensure that information was received and clearly presented. In their response, some panelists had nothing more to contribute while other panelists were compelled to contribute additional comments.

Round III. In the third round, I asked the panelists to rank the items as summarized from previous rounds and to review their judgments, providing reasons and clarifications for their judgments and identifying additional relevance to their answers given in previous rounds. At this point there was a low expectation that the consensus would vary significantly (Dalkey, 1972; Hsu & Sandford, 2007; Weaver, 1971).

Panelist Selection

For the purpose of this study, panelists were selected from HBCUs in the United States from among candidates who were familiar with student recruitment and enrollment policy, international student services, and other administrators such as deans. A large percentage of the panelists held positions at the level of dean. Below is a breakdown of participants in the study.

Table 3.1

Study Participants

<u>Job Title</u>	<u>Number of Participants</u>
Dean	4
Enrollment Management	2
VP	2
Director	1

According to Hsu and Sandford (2007), the criteria used to guide subject selection should be related to an individual's background and experiences regarding the issues of the study and their capacity to contribute useful input. Subjects should also be willing to revise their initial judgments for the purpose of reaching consensus (Pill, 1971). The subjects can also be members of a management team who are either decision makers who are likely to utilize the outcomes or alumni and professional staff members.

In the literature, there is no consensus as to what constitutes the ideal number of subjects in a Delphi study. Adler and Ziglio (1996) suggests that an appropriate use of Delphi is when the “primary source of information sought is informed judgment” (p. 21). Delbecq, Van de Ven, and Gustafson (1975) suggested that researchers should utilize a minimally sufficient number of 10 to 15 if the backgrounds of the subjects are homogenous; however for heterogeneous groups as used in this study Clayton (1997) suggests that only 5 to 10 expert panelists are needed for a Delphi study. It was useful that each panelist participating in this study was employed at HBCUs in senior positions, which allowed points of views of policy and interactions with staff and in some instances students and the wider community.

An element that emerged from this sample was that six of the nine respondents from the study had earned terminal degrees, and two of the nine respondents were pursuing a Ph.D. While their responses to the questions in the survey were indicators that there was a dedication to the mission of HBCU education, some responded that they were not educated at HBCUs. In addition, the two panelists pursuing terminal degrees are doing so at PWIs.

The consistent thread of the panelists was knowledge of desegregation at HBCUs and the intended and unintended effects of this on individual institutions. Consensus can be reached in a smaller group of subjects as this is a discreet cohort of institutions and stakeholders. As such, I sought a maximum of ten senior administrators who had knowledge of desegregation legislation and would have had opportunities to have witnessed firsthand its effects on their individual institutions or administrative areas.

For the purpose of the study, I was able to interrogate administrators and deans who are experts on HBCUs in areas of policy as well as administrators at institutions for whom the policy

impacts. While they did not have intimate knowledge of the legislation impacting the policy, this was explained through the introduction.

Controlled feedback utilized in Delphi is designed to reduce the effect of what Dalkey (1972) calls noise. This is the normal communication that occurs within group dynamics, but also distorts the data as it leans toward individual interests. An additional characteristic and advantage of the Delphi process is that anonymity lessens the opportunity of dominance of any one particular subject. Therefore the likelihood of negative group dynamics such as manipulation or coercion is negated. Finally, the process of multiple iterations allows subjects to become more oriented toward problem solving to offer their opinions more insightfully and to minimize the effect of noise.

Data Collection

For the purpose of this study, I highlight two elements defining a Delphi study that lend themselves to the usefulness of this approach. Adler and Ziglio (1996) suggest that in order for the Delphi method to be most useful, several elements should be present.

The first is that the problem does not require precise analytical techniques and the second is that the problem will benefit from collective consensus, which suggests that this study will benefit from the use of Delphi. Following approval from the dissertation committee and the IRB chair, I proceeded to the phase of collecting data. Using the recommendations from colleagues and leaders in the field, I began to contact potential panelists.

As mentioned above, most Delphi research requires at least three rounds in order to allow the researcher to gain an objective consensus of expert judgment on the subject, in this case, the perceived effects of the *Fordice* remedies at HBCUs. “The Delphi process can be continuously iterated until consensus is determined to have been achieved” (Hsu & Sanford, 2007, p. 2). Due

to the sensitive nature of this research, all precautions were taken to respect the anonymity of the participant.

Once the participants were identified through recommendations from colleagues, the panelists were approached through an introductory email. Understanding the perceived sensitivity surrounding HBCU leadership and in anticipation of reticence of potential participants, I petitioned the committee to have permission to make introductory telephone calls and to gather initial data during the rounds. Once permission was granted, phone calls were made to potential panelists. While this process deviated from the original proposed process because emails were not being responded to, it yielded substantial data. Panelists were open regarding HBCU leadership in the 21st century and desegregation. The selection process was based on the willingness of panelists to agree to participate. Follow-up calls were made thanking the panelist for participating.

The process began with the open-ended questions in the first round. This process allowed participants to reflect on their organizations and answer the questions without reserve and with candor and authenticity. For the second round, the answers were distilled into a summary, which was subsequently emailed to each respondent accompanied by a letter reiterating the process and purpose of the study. In this round, the responses were outlined for all participants to review. Stimulated by the answers of the Delphi panel, participants were asked if there were additional points they would like to add to the list of responses. During the third and final round, participants were asked to rank order their combined responses to the three questions. As there were three original questions and fewer than 10 responses for each item, participants were asked to rank order the answers. A number was assigned to each item therefore no item would be unranked and all had order of importance according to each participant. For example, the

statements that were deemed most important would be assigned the rank of one, the second most important would be given a two until each item received a number. Copies of all surveys are included in the Appendix.

Data Analysis

This qualitative research design consisted of survey questionnaires with a set of questions to gather initial data and information on the perceived effects of the *Fordice* decision on HBCUs. I used open-ended questions to gain information from subjects regarding their opinions on the effects of the *Fordice* decision on their institutions. In subsequent rounds, following the first questionnaire, the goal of this study was to gain a level of consensus regarding the central tendencies and judgments of the panelists (Hasson, Keeney, & McKenna, 2000).

Round I Data Analysis

After collecting the data from the participants during this beginning round, it became clear that each institution had specific issues that were relevant particularly to them while there were other recurring themes that would continue to emerge with each iteration. Responses regarding desegregation were varied. Some implied that desegregation should not be a priority and that in their current state, it would be unlikely to attract the numbers of white or non-black students without intentionality. Analysis was ongoing as with each iteration, I determined that consensus on some issues was emerging in terms of desegregation and leadership.

Round Two Data Analysis

After the second round of questions, I compiled the list of responses from each participant and asked them if they had additional comments. For Round II there was a 55% response rate. There were seven initial responses to the first question with two additional responses added after this round. There were six initial responses to the second question with one

additional response after Round II and seven initial responses to the third question with no additional responses after Round II. Two of the participants that responded stated that they had nothing to add, however, three offered additional comments. One of the challenges of Delphi studies is that the response rates can be low. In order to avoid this, participants were given a window of no more than 6 weeks from Round I to Round III. Additionally, follow-up phone calls to ensure that the surveys had been received were placed several days after sending the information via email. This was established at the beginning of the process and time limits and turnaround time was reiterated with each round.

It should be noted that in one instance, the participant did not receive the information as it went into their SPAM. A potential limitation of conducting research using electronic methods to contact the participants is that if the email address is unknown or unfamiliar it could potentially be blocked by the receiver's server. Without making enquiries, I would have assumed that the participant did not wish to or was unable to contribute to that round, however, this was not the case.

Round III Data Analysis

For this round, participants' rankings were analyzed for emerging themes and emerging consensus regarding the effects of desegregation on HBCUs and to determine their positions as to whether changes in leadership could positively affect the sustainability of these institutions. According to the literature, the "kind and type of criteria to use to both define and determine consensus in a Delphi study is subject to interpretation" (Hsu & Sandford, 2007, p. 4). Consensus is therefore determined if an agreed percentage of the votes falls within the majority of the subjects' rankings through successive iterations. I interpreted, analyzed and ranked the emerging themes.

Limitations of This Delphi Study

In this study the Delphi Method provided a technique for generating consensus of expert in the field of HBCUs. Because this Delphi group drew upon consensus from their expertise at their particular institutions, results in some instances were not applicable to other institutions. For example, some institutions did not focus on desegregation issues because enrollment was low and the attention of the leadership was on increasing the student population. This was mentioned by 2 of the 9 institutions represented.

The limitations and weaknesses of this study are in part due to the technique applied to analyzing the data. Anonymity of the panelist was a positive element as it protected the panelists and their identity. The panelists had similar experiences and shared areas of concern that were consistent across several institutions. However the disaffection of the African American academic and their challenges in the academy could have tainted the view of the experts. Their perceptions of equity and leadership were similar although they came from different colleges. The study was also limited by the use of CRT, which assumed that certain biases existed which affected the outcomes of these colleges.

Challenges to the Study

Because of the nature of this study and the deeply ingrained race-based legacy at higher education institutions in the United States, specific challenges to obtaining the data I sought emerged. During the pilot phase, I discovered that conducting research with primary data regarding perceptions of leadership and effects of desegregation legislation on individual colleges and universities would present challenges because college officials were reticent and guarded about being a part of this potential study out of fear that their support of research that evaluates new ways of addressing the problem of desegregation in higher education

environments could be considered counter to the focus of their current leadership and administration. I sought to minimize this challenge by reassuring participants that all results would remain confidential.

There are numerous challenges in conducting research with ethnic minority populations, some of which are overlooked by investigators and researchers. Some of the methodological difficulties in conducting research among ethnic populations stem from the construction of knowledge and the perception of the minority population. Moynihan's (1965) report on the Negro family is an example of false results or misguided preconceptions resulting from an inadequate survey instrument. This occurs when the researcher brings her perceptions of the subject into the research process by elevating or problematizing the subject, which in turn affects the results. In his report, Moynihan viewed the black family through a white lens and family model. His view led him to the following findings:

The family structure of lower-class Negroes is highly unstable, and in many urban centers is approaching complete breakdown. The emergence and increasing visibility of a Negro middle-class may beguile the nation into supposing that the circumstances of the remainder of the Negro community are equally prosperous, whereas just the opposite is true at present and is likely to continue. (p. 98)

In this case the researcher's approach led him to the conclusion that the Negro family in the 1960s was substandard, yet this conclusion did not account for the effects of oppression and centuries of institutional dismantling on the black family. Moynihan's results persuade the reader that it is the inherent failing of the Negro family and not oppression that has contributed to their plight. The results can thus be seen as skewed from a subjective perspective.

Currently, a Eurocentric paradigm and way of knowing guides much of the research in areas of diversity in higher education, particularly in the area of quantitative investigation; however, Padilla and Lindholm (2001) posited that the Eurocentric approach has frequently led

to misguided interpretations because of specific biases inherent in the paradigms themselves. To avoid this, I utilized Black Feminist thought as an anchor to support and appreciate diversity throughout this process as Black Feminist thought provides an appreciation for group differences based on race, class, and social injustices.

Ethical Considerations

Mauthner and Doucet (2003) suggested that utilizing reflexivity in research requires reflection and accountability regarding personal, emotional, theoretical, epistemological, interpersonal, and political influences on the research. In my examination of legislation and policies affecting HBCUs and their creation and sustainability, I took care to be mindful of my relationship with the research, the subject matter, and the panelists understanding that socially responsible research involves being aware of how the researcher engages their study participants. While the research is aligned to the researcher culturally, and in this case I consider myself a cultural insider, there may be insider/outsider cultural considerations affecting the results.

Macfarlane (2009) asserted that confidentiality in research is often not as important for participants as previous research guidelines have suggested, arguing that participants are vulnerable is a patronizing assumption. For the purposes of this study, however, I perceived the panelists or subjects as vulnerable and thus treated them and their responses with extreme respect, confidentiality, and duty of care and did not place participants at risk in any way.

Chapter IV: Data Analysis and Discussion

The purpose of this Delphi study was to gain consensus around the effects of desegregation legislation at HBCUs and discover if there are strategies to assist leadership in future sustainability. The process of collecting background data for this study began in January 2012 to answer this research question: Does the *Fordice* decision and the concept of Interest Convergence prevent HBCUs from becoming a cohort of viable institutions or have these institutions been relegated to a position where they continue to struggle and justify their existence? The secondary question was: can leadership of HBCUs be re-framed for sustainability in the 21st century? To answer these questions, background information was collected during the preliminary research phase.

During the ILA process, I collected information about leadership and the effects of the *Fordice* decision. At this time, I contacted several Mississippi public institutions. Links were made with the leadership of two state PWIs in Mississippi. Comments given by the leadership of these institutions were consistent with the findings of this study. Information obtained during that process was not intended for data analysis however (while not included in this study) was of substantial quality and consistent with the findings and consensus.

This chapter contains the results of the data collection and analysis and is outlined as follows: a) response rate of the study, b) participants in the study, c) participating institutions' student enrollment, e) results of round 1, f) results of round 2, g) results of round 3, and h) summary of the formal findings of the Delphi study results and some provocative observations that build on the findings, but were not identified as formal themes.

Response Rate

The study was conducted with expert panelists from various HBCUs across the country. Panelists were employed by the HBCU institution they represented in the study. The sample included academic officers, academic deans, enrollment management officers and student affairs deans. From the list of 14 potential expert participants, nine agreed to participate representing nine HBCU's. Of the nine participants, 100% responded to the first round. These participants were contacted via email and telephone. The data generated from the first round were the basis for the second and subsequent rounds. Responses ranged from areas of concerns surrounding leadership and desegregation with some respondents listing international education as an area of focus. The emerging themes highlighted areas such as more focused leadership, intentional desegregation efforts and raising overall standards and were consistent with the extant literature and information garnered from the pilot phase with the exception of a focus on international education. The second round of the study had a lower response rate of 55%. Panelists were emailed the comments from all participants and asked to add any additional comments generated by what others stated. Five of the nine participants responded to round two with statements that they had nothing to add or by producing additional comments. The third round yielded a 77% response rate, however one of the participants completed the rankings inappropriately therefore, the responses were voided. The remaining 66% of responses were used in the third round of study.

While most HBCUs are located in the Southern region of the United States, geographic diversity is represented as four of the colleges are in northern states, Ohio, Maryland, Pennsylvania and five are in southern states, South Carolina, Alabama and Kentucky. While Mississippi was the primary state named in the original *Fordice* decision, the effects of

desegregation legislation are far reaching. Mississippi colleges were approached, however administrators of HBCUs in the state were unavailable for the study.

Participants of the Study

The panelists held key positions within their institutions uniquely placing them to have experiences with student populations and changes in policies regarding recruitment or desegregation and the impact of leadership on these issues. All participants were at Director level or higher and represented Academic Affairs, Enrollment Management, Student Affairs and the 1890 Fund (this being specific to a Morrill Land Grant 2 institution). Table 4.1 outlines the representative states of participants of the study.

Table 4.1

States Represented in the Study

<u>Participating Institutions by State</u>	<u>Number of Participants</u>
Alabama	3
Kentucky	1
Maryland	1
Pennsylvania	2
Ohio	1
South Carolina	1

Some of the colleges have already reached a significant percentage of non-black students as well as international students. One in particular has reached over 30% non-black students and purports a 20% international student cohort. This growing number of international students is due to the targeted recruitment efforts of a new institutional focus and a recent appointment of an international student services director.

The following table outlines the enrollment numbers of the participating colleges in the study.

Table 4.2

Participating Institutions Student Enrollment

<u>Enrollment Numbers</u>	<u>Number of participating colleges in study</u>
Under 1,000	-
1,000 – 2000	2
2001 – 3000	3
3001 – 4,000	-
4,001 – 5,000	-
5001 – 6,000	1
over 6,000	2

Round One

The Delphi Technique was used for this study. The goal was to allow a format for expert panelists to come to agreement or present differing opinions regarding the leadership and sustainability of HBCU institutions. In addition, the research questions helped to frame the enquiry. During the first round, participants responded to several open ended questions. As stated in Chapter Three, questions were developed from the extant literature and informed by the pilot study and consultation with experts in higher education, including leaders of institutions in southern states whom the *Fordice* decision directly affects.

Over a two-week period of time, the expert panelists received email communications and telephone calls as well as text reminders. During the first round, all of the participants who agreed to participate commented on the initial three questions. The study was designed to be administered in a short span of time because of the nature of the work of the expert panelists. Also, another factor dictating a swift process was that there were high demands on the expert panelists' roles as administrators and devoting large periods of time to participate in this study could have presented a deterrent. A design incorporating too much time from the participants could also contribute to low response rates. To mitigate the potential of low responses, an instrument and data collection process was created which used electronic technologies to

facilitate the distribution of questions and general communications with experts. Witkin and Altschuld (1995) suggests that technology aids the Delphi process by taking advantage of storage, processing, speed of transmission, maintenance of respondents anonymity and the potential for rapid feedback.

During the first round, the participants were engaged in answering the following questions without restraint: What if anything should HBCUs do to encourage desegregation? How might institutional leadership affect desegregation? And, What are the major challenges facing HBCUs regarding desegregation legislation, funding and policy changes? They were encouraged to offer additional statements that could add to the topic of HBCU challenges and sustainability as well as desegregation and leadership. The purpose was to engender additional information to further inform the study and assist in the analysis of anticipated emerging data.

Information gathered from the nine respondents was summarized and distilled into a list that served as the foundation for Round Two. Much of what was relayed was an urgency to increase quality of the offerings to students as well as to focus on being fiscally solvent and having leadership that focused on sustainability. Participants were open and candidly offered information regarding challenges to their institutions. On several occasions, the information provided was more detailed than could be included in the study as the comments from panelists did not directly address the questions, however, some of the comments have been highlighted in this chapter. The questions for the study were framed to inform and answer the research questions: does the *Fordice* decision and the inferences of Interest Convergence prevent HBCUs from becoming a cohort of viable institutions or have these institutions been relegated to a position where they continue to struggle and justify their existence and can leadership of HBCUs be re-framed for sustainability in the 21st century?

Emerging Themes from Round One

Themes that emerged from the open-ended questions focused primarily on how to make these institutions more appealing to non-black students. It was suggested by two participants that revamping recruitment strategies and materials would assist colleges in reaching their desegregation goals. However, many expert panelists highlighted the need for these institutions to seek parity with their white counterparts. One commented, “our school was founded because of land grants, however it does not receive equitable funding. The closest PWI received funding at a rate of \$4.00 to our \$1.00”.

Other panelists suggested that a focus on enrollment numbers in general would be essential to sustainability and improving their standards while meeting the needs of the intended population would be useful. The panelist commented:

Recruiting non-black students does exclude us from creating more policies to include everyone. I don’t see it as diluting the mission. There is a need for HBCUs and as we open our doors, we must not forget those students that need to have that extra attention to those who don’t have high ACT but those who will benefit from this education. This can be a problem for schools forced to take students with higher stats and exclude students with lower scores. In that realm, some may feel that they may be getting away from their mission as you loose [*sic*] a number of students that don’t meet the criteria. As long as the minority students are not being left out, I think targeted desegregation is not a problem.

Other issues arising from the first round were: focus on international recruitment, and increase partnerships with local businesses to raise profile. One dean of a business school pointed out that raising the business profile and focusing on internationalization would be most useful to its graduates. Recruiting has been more intentional. It has been especially more significant in the college of business so that the students will graduate with Entrepreneurship and International Business.

At this point in the initial round it seemed that a consensus would be difficult to reach in terms of which item(s) should be prioritized, as all issues presented by panelists seemed to have significance and importance. Through the responses, it became clear that the original questions were being addressed by all of the panelists in ways that were specific to their institutions.

Summary of Round One Panelist Response

The following are the responses to the three open ended questions presented to the nine panelists.

1. What if anything should HBCU's do to encourage desegregation?
 - Desegregation should not be the priority
 - Hire a non-black recruiter to appeal to the other race students
 - Focus on enrollment in general.
 - Recruit in places that will yield non-black students.
 - Recruit mostly white and non-black students.
 - Revamp admissions material to be more reflective of a multi-cultural student body.
 - Create an international student services department
2. How might institutional leadership affect desegregation?
 - Dictate that the institution should meet certain criteria in diversifying its student body.
 - Earmark funding for non-black students.
 - Insist on equality within the state system between PWIs and HBCUs.
 - Do a better job of financial management and governance.
 - Encourage international recruitment.
3. What are the major challenges facing HBCUs regarding desegregation legislation, funding and policy changes?
 - Having leadership that is focused on what will make us sustainable.
 - Reducing inequity in funding as compared to PWIs.
 - Competing with duplicate programs from neighboring Predominately White Institutions.
 - Making our college appealing to white students.

- Maintaining accreditation.
- Increasing enrollment overall.
- Maintaining fiscal solvency.
- Maintaining academic standards while also having an open admissions policy.

It became clear through this first round that there were a range of challenges that HBCUs face regarding desegregation and leadership in the 21st century. There was a tendency towards consensus on several issues, as some of the responses were duplicated or re-framed by participants to suit their institution. Several panelists mentioned governance and the need for maintaining fiscal solvency. A panelist stated:

Resources are low. Students want better facilities like workout facilities, new dorms and residence halls, and when that cannot be provided it makes it hard to sell the school. Probably in the early and mid 90's we peaked in enrollment. The university is trying to re-invent itself to be more viable.

Another concern consistently mentioned by panelists was, maintaining academic standards. This theme emerged from at least five of the nine respondents. However, in some instances it was not a primary concern. Most panelists suggested that their institutions were always open to students from all ethnic groups and that they never resisted integrating their student body or faculty. Panelists however, consistently voiced resistance to the perception that their institutions must take in a percentage of non-black students as forcing higher numbers could have negative affects.

A panelist from an HBCU in the South stated, "Our mission states that we admit the students who may have deficiencies based on the educational systems that they come from. That does not exclude us from moving forward and enhancing policies that include everyone."

Another panelist stated,

By inviting all students, I don't see it as diluting the mission. There is a need for HBCUs and as we open our doors, we must not forget those students that need to have extra attention and those who don't have high ACT scores. These students will benefit from an

HBCU education. It can be a problem for schools forced to take students with higher scores, as some may feel that we may be getting away from the mission. We will lose [*sic*] the opportunity to reach a number of students that don't meet the criteria.

One panelist passionately shared concerns regarding the role of HBCUs in educating minority students:

My fear is that if we are not careful we will lose good Black students. PWIs are recruiting the high fliers [Black students] based on test scores and they are going to other schools leaving the HBCUs to educate those with lower test scores. Test scores are not indicators of intellect nor whether the students will be able to succeed. We could start to lean towards accepting students [White] with higher scores and excluding students (Black) who would need our services. HBCUs are excluding students that traditionally needed to be brought into our institutions.

Responses were distilled and distributed to the panelists and were the basis for round two.

Round Two

The data from Round One were listed for the participants under each of the three questions. Participants were emailed the list of responses and asked to review their responses and, stimulated by comments from other panelists, add any additional comments they felt addressed their institutions. Two of the participants stated that they had no further comments; however three additional comments were added to the existing responses of the original survey.

For the first question, which read: "What if anything, should HBCUs do to encourage desegregation?", the following two items were added in round two by participants:

- Focus on integrating graduate programs, distance learning or adult learning
- Have programs that make them unique and that will attract white students.

Information provided by the participants suggests that desegregation should not be a priority.

Indeed, one participant stated in a follow-up conversation that the questions in the study made the participant feel as if the HBCUs were insufficient in their own right and would only be acceptable if white students integrated them and were encouraged to attend in larger numbers. It was reiterated to the panelist that these were the items highlighted by other panelists and, indeed

some of the comments were made by this panelist. However, in isolation as presented on a list, the items listed with which the panelist contested could be construed in a negative light.

The argument of the panelist was that ‘white’ was still normative and while diversifying generally refers to students of color, in this regard, white students bring diversity to HBCU campuses. However, students of color still provide a diverse context for learning.

The second question: How might institutional leadership effect desegregation, stimulated additional comments which were:

- Increase partnerships with community colleges and two-year Associates Degree granting institutions.
- Encourage international partnerships
- Encourage partnerships with local business

The second question stimulated an immediate consensus on one item. However, in this area, elements of leadership’s challenges were revealed by several participants. While the institutions were varied, the problems perceived by the participants and challenges to their leadership were similar. Most of the participants agreed that seeking equity between HBCUs and PWIs was essential to moving forward in the 21st century. However, their reasons were varied regarding how they saw their leadership achieving or not achieving this. Several experts in the South agreed with the perception that their institutions were not of equal value. One panelist stated:

The state has been neutral in terms of enforcing how the university trustees should be chosen. In our case, someone nominates a person to the board who is a friend or colleague and the governor generally agrees without extensive vetting. The university appears to be of no consequence because they have several state PWIs within close proximity of the HBCU.

The final question stated: “What are the major challenges facing HBCUs regarding desegregation legislation, funding and policy changes?”. This question stimulated no additional

comments from any of the participants.

Below is the amalgamated list of initial responses and additional responses solicited through round two.

Question 1: What, if anything, should HBCUs do to encourage desegregation?

1. Focus on enrollment in general.
2. Revamp admissions materials to be more reflective of a multi-cultural student body.
3. Have programs that make them unique and that will attract white students.
4. Recruit in places that will yield non-black students
5. Desegregation should not be the priority.
6. Focus on integrating graduate programs, distance learning or adult learning programs if they exist.
7. Create an international student services department.
8. Recruit mostly white and non-black students.
9. Hire a non-black recruiter to appeal to other race students

Question 2: How might institutional leadership affect desegregation?

1. Insist on equality within the state system between PWIs and HBCUs.
2. Increase partnerships with community colleges or other two-year degree granting institutions.
3. Encourage international recruitment.
4. Dictate that the institution should meet certain criteria in diversifying its student body.
5. Do a better job of financial management and governance and
6. Increase partnerships with local business to raise profile
7. Encourage international partnerships.
8. Earmark funding for non-black students

Question 3: What are the major challenges facing HBCUs regarding desegregation legislation, funding and policy changes?

1. Having leadership that is focused on what will make us sustainable.
2. Maintaining fiscal solvency.
3. Reducing inequity in funding as compared to PWIs.

4. Maintaining accreditation.
5. Increasing enrollment overall.
6. Competing with duplicate programs from neighboring PWIs.
7. Making our college appealing to white students.
8. Maintaining academic standards while also having an open admissions policy

Round Three

Round Three was sent to all nine expert panelists. The response rate for the third and final round of this study was 77% as seven of the nine surveys were returned initially, however one of the seven expert panelists returned their survey incorrectly ranked, therefore it could not be included in the study. As a result of the one misranked returned survey, 66% of the surveys that were sent out were used for the final consensus. Panelists were asked to rank order the items in order of importance to their organization, assigning “1” to the item they believed to be most important and “2” to the next most important item, and so on until all items were rank-ordered.

For Question One a possibility of 1-9 existed for rankings; Question Two, a possibility of 1-8 existed for rankings and for Question Three, the possibility of 1-8 exists for rankings. Within each question, the items are ranked in order of priority according to the expert panelists’ experiences. Rankings of 1 and 2 indicate the highest priority. Table 4.3 outlines the final panelists’ rankings as priorities.

Table 4.3

Panelist List of Priorities for HBCUs

1. What, if anything, should HBCUs do to encourage desegregation?

	Priority Ranking	Rank Total
Desegregation should not be the priority.	9,1,8,2,9,1	30
Hire a non-black recruiter to appeal to other-race students.	4,8,4,8,1,3	28
Focus on enrollment in general	5,2,1,4,4,2	18
Recruit in places that will yield non-black students.	6,3,2,7,3,7	28
Recruit mostly white and non-black students.	7,9,7,9,8,8	48

Re-vamp admissions materials to be more reflective of a multi-cultural student body.	3,4,3,3,2,5	20
Create an international students services department.	8,7,6,6,5,4	36
Focus on integrating graduate programs, distance learning or adult learning programs if they exist.	1,5,5,5,7,8	31
Have programs that make them unique and that will attract white students.	2,6,1,1,6,6	22

2. How might institutional leadership affect desegregation?

	Priority Ranking	Rank Total
Dictate that the institution should meet certain criteria in diversifying its student body.	3,6,4,7,7,2	29
Earmark funding for non-black students.	8,7,5,8,1,8	37
Insist on equality within the state system between PWIs and HBCUs.	1,1,1,1,2,4	10
Do a better job of financial management and governance.	2,8,2,6,5,7	30
Encourage international recruitment.	4,5,3,5,4,5	26
Increase partnerships with community colleges or other two-year degree granting institutions.	4,3,7,2,3,1	20
Encourage international partnerships.	6,4,6,4,6,6	32
Increase partnerships with local business to raise profile.	5,2,8,3,8,3	29

3. What are the major challenges facing HBCUs regarding desegregation legislation, funding and policy changes?

	Priority Rankings	Rank Total
Having leadership that is focused on what will make us sustainable	3,5,6,2,1,4	21
Reducing inequity in funding as compared to PWIs.	4,1,3,6,7,3	24
Competing with duplicate programs from neighboring Predominately White Institutions.	1,2,7,7,8,6	31
Making our college appealing to white students.	5,8,8,8,2,8	39
Maintaining accreditation.	8,6,4,4,3,2	27
Increasing enrollment overall.	7,4,2,5,4,5	27
Maintaining fiscal solvency.	6,3,5,3,5,1	23
Maintaining academic standards while also having an open admission policy.	2,7,1,1,6,7	24

The following lists the results of the panelists' rankings. The list has been re-ordered from highest priority to lowest.

Question 1: What, if anything, should HBCUs do to encourage desegregation?

1. Focus on enrollment in general.
2. Re-vamp admissions materials to be more reflective of a multi-cultural student body.
3. Have programs that make them unique and that will attract white students.
4. Recruit in places that will yield non-black students and Hire a non-black recruiter to appeal to other-race students. (Both ranked 4th)
5. Desegregation should not be the priority.
6. Focus on integrating graduate programs, distance learning or adult learning programs if they exist.
7. Create an international student services department.
8. Recruit mostly white and non-black students.

Question 2: How might institutional leadership affect desegregation?

1. Insist on equality within the state system between PWIs and HBCUs.
2. Increase partnerships with community colleges or other two-year degree granting institutions.
3. Encourage international recruitment.
4. Dictate that the institution should meet certain criteria in diversifying its student body. Increase partnerships with local business to raise profile (Both ranked 4)
5. Do a better job of financial management and governance and increase partnerships with local business to raise profile.
6. Encourage international partnerships.

7. Earmark funding for non-black students

Question 3: What are the major challenges facing HBCUs regarding desegregation legislation, funding and policy changes?

1. Having leadership that is focused on what will make us sustainable.
2. Maintaining fiscal solvency.
3. Reducing inequity in funding as compared to PWIs and; maintaining academic standards while also having an open admissions policy (Both Ranked 3rd)
4. Maintaining accreditation.
5. Increasing enrollment overall.
6. Competing with duplicate programs from neighboring PWIs.
7. Making our college appealing to white students.

In the second round of the study, additional themes emerged such as the development of adult and distance learning and creating programs that make HBCUs unique and appealing to non- Black students, including international students. Three participants revealed that they had no confidence in their leadership and felt that their trustees were inept and were not properly vetted. Another participant clearly stated that they felt that their failings as an HBCU were of no consequence to their state as the primary focus and resources are being funneled to the PWI in the state. Reducing inequity was a recurring theme

Integration of Findings

The rankings produced a wide range of priorities depending on the institution, geographic location and other factors, which could not be accounted for in this study. In some instances, institutions in the same state focused on different priorities depending on their institutional needs.

Analysis of Responses to Question One

Question 1 produced a trend towards consensus as 5 of the 6 respondents (83%) ranked that institutions should focus on enrollment in their top 4 choices out of 9 potential ranks, with 3 respondents provided a ranking of 1 or 2. The second highest priority was: revamping admissions materials which 5 out of 6 respondents ranked the item from 2-4 out of a potential ranking of 9. While there were some trends towards consensus in other priority areas, consensus was not reached for a second priority.

It bears stating that most of the panelists ranked one item as the lowest priority, which was recruit mostly white and non- black students. In this instance, each of the 6 expert panelists ranked this item between 7 and 9. According to the research in earlier chapters, this conflicts with remedies of *Fordice*, as recruiting non-black students is essential to compliance with the Supreme Court's decision. The point of contention for the panelists was that the settlement does not include funding for black students to attend PWIs nor funding to attend HBCUs. Funding is however attached to white students attending HBCUs. A panelist stated that 'HBCU's should not spend their time recruiting and educating white students as so many Black students remain underserved'. Another stated that they did not see reasons for recruiting white students as HBCUs have never been closed to this population and asked why a white student would want to come to an HBCU. Respondents reached an agreement that recruitment of white students should not be a priority of HBCUs.

There was an astonishing lack of consensus on the question regarding desegregation. The statement presented for ranking was: "Desegregation should not be the priority". Table 4.4 provides a breakdown of the responses:

Table 4.4

Panelists Breakdown of Disagreement

Number of Panelist	Panelist Ranking
2	Panelists ranked as the lowest possible priority providing the ranking of 9
2	Panelists ranked as the next to lowest priority providing the ranking of 8
1	Panelist ranked as the second highest priority providing a ranking of 2
2	Panelists ranked as highest priority providing a ranking of 1

Analysis of Responses to Question Two

Question 2: How might institutional leadership affect desegregation? In this area, all participants with the exception of one provided a ranking between 1 and 2 for the statement, “insist on equality within the state system between PWIs and HBCUs.” The challenge here is that HBCUs were never intended to be equal, therefore, there have been systemic barriers to their reaching parity with their PWI counterparts. Inequitable funding, and governance are just a few issues which should be considered when discussing HBCUs reaching equity within state systems. Insisting that leadership take on their benefactors and funders to demand equal footing and resources could have potentially positive effects however, requires a new paradigm. Historically, HBCU presidents have been hand chosen by benefactors and funders or influential members of state government. There has been a delicate balance between appeasing the funders and holding institutions together. New ways of thinking and new leadership will dictate a less paternalistic approach to funding and equity in higher education across many states that house and support both PWIs and HBCUs.

The second and additional priority was increasing partnerships with community colleges or other two-year degree granting institutions. This was a recurring topic with several panelists. The focus was not to re-create programs that were offered by two-year institutions, but to

capitalize on the foundational work that HBCUs are known for providing to its students and enhancing this work through meaningful partnerships with 2-year institutions. Panelists recognized that HBCUs accept students with lower scores and students that come from poorer communities and schools. Lack of preparation for the academy is a consistent problem, however some panelist suggested that focusing on the good work in providing foundational support through ACT 101 programs or foundation course-work will build on their strength and cement a place in Higher Education.

There was agreement on two areas of lowest priority: Encourage international partnerships and earmarking funding for non-black students. Contrary to the consensus, one panelist suggested that international partnerships are essential to becoming a competitive institution. This panelist stated: “Because of the international trade in our state, the dean has advantaged graduates with the city’s international companies. There has been a state international trade mission of which several of our professors attend and make international contacts.”

The respondents did not rank international partnerships or global education as a high priority; however, trends in higher education suggest that this is an area of development that all institutions should consider, which I cite examples and discuss later in this chapter.

Analysis of Responses to Question Three

Question 3: What are the major challenges facing HBCUs regarding desegregation legislation, funding and policy changes? The rankings for this question were more disparate than rankings for previous questions. While there was a trend towards agreement of high priority areas such as having leadership focus on what will make HBCUs sustainable and maintaining

fiscal solvency, there was also agreement that making these colleges appealing to white students should not be a priority.

The data revealed panelists considered reducing the numbers of duplicate programming and reducing inequity within the state systems of education as priorities as well as maintaining enrollment numbers to keep the colleges open. Consensus was achieved on items such as seeking parity within the state system, however, there was also agreement regarding not making desegregation a primary focus of the leadership. What was noteworthy in this study is the high level of disagreement and lack of consensus on desegregation. In the instance of question two regarding what institutions should do to encourage desegregation, consensus was not close to being reached.

On the issue of desegregation, the high level of disagreement was noteworthy. This disagreement indicates competing priorities within the HBCU system and the academy as each administrator of HBCUs is aware of the challenges to funding and sustainability. In addition HBCU administrators are aware of the mandates from the states regarding desegregation as this continues to remain a point of discussion. Therefore, on this essential and fundamental issue, one could expect consensus, however, because of the perception of more pressing concerns, little importance was given to the point of desegregation in the HBCU system.

Discussion on Desegregation of HBCUs

It was perhaps telling that consensus could not be reached regarding recruitment of non-black students at HBCUs and desegregation in general. During the *Fordice* deliberations and ultimate rulings and suggested remedies, the Supreme Court noted that the PWIs and HBCUs in the state of Mississippi and border-states were established to provide segregation to their individual state populations. The PWIs were designated as state flagship institutions while the HBCUs were considered regional or urban colleges with limited missions. Funding was

therefore more robust for the PWIs. The court concluded that maintaining all of the state institutions within close geographical range with only the racial demography of the campus being the identifying factor was wasteful and eventually would need to be resolved on a state-by-state basis.

The system of segregation in the US is based on what K. Brown (2005) calls *Traditional Americanism*. This is the belief that black people in some ways do not measure up to the relevant norm (Brown, 2005, p. 184). Using Whiteness as the norm explains the notion of Blacks as inferior, which later contributed to socio-economic and environmental factors. Blacks as substandard is a concept steeped in a tradition of four centuries in America and has translated to the educational environment. This concept permeated slavery and ultimately reconstruction and governed how these new citizens would be educated.

Even the *Brown* decision in some ways attributed de jure segregation to the fact that Blacks were less than. “Thus, school desegregation was needed, not in spite of, but precisely because African-Americans were not the equals of Caucasians” (Brown, 2005, p. 184). While not all educators or advocates of multi-cultural education believed in the sub standard nature of Blacks in education, we are visiting old territory with the desegregation of HBCUs as the cultural deprivation of blacks resulting from the *Brown* decision are similar issues that plague higher education resulting from *Fordice*. Pride of race and culture are central to the identification and cultural traditions of HBCUs, which was sacrificed during *Brown v Board* and could be diluted as a result of *Fordice*.

As PWIs historically received more funding and offer duplicate programs, HBCUs are more vulnerable. The court did not offer special dispensation for HBCUs on the basis of culture and heritage. Therefore “there is real concern, that some of the nineteen southern and border

states, will use the Supreme court's ruling to reduce the role of the HBCU. This could be the consequence of such steps as merging black schools into larger white schools or simply closing some black schools because they duplicate courses offered at predominately white schools" (Roebuck & Murty, 1993, p. 675).

An alternative approach to desegregation emerging from the study supported by the work of several HBCU campuses was the use of internationalization as a tool for desegregation. Internationalization of HBCUs is in line with trends in higher education and globalization. The following responses to the questions correlate with internationalization of HBCU campuses.

Question 1: What, if anything, should HBCUs do to encourage desegregation?

- Create an international student services department. (Ranked 7th)

Question 2: How might institutional leadership affect desegregation?

- Encourage international recruitment. (Ranked 3rd)
- Encourage international partnerships. (Ranked 6th)

One campus represented in the study currently celebrates successful desegregation efforts attributed to the internationalization of their campus through intentional efforts to increase the international student population, particularly in Asian countries. The school has an Asian Student Affairs program offering enrichment and language skills to assist the international student to become acclimated to the American education system. This HBCU has made a commitment to diversifying through internationalization and reports over 25% non-black students which is higher than many HBCUs.

A positive consensus regarding desegregation was that HBCUs should make efforts to increase their international footprint in higher education by widening participation and intentionally making inroads to recruiting international students. Development of international

education and increasing the international student population was consistent with the trends in higher education in PWIs as well. International students bring significant revenue and diversity to the campus and surrounding community. While not white Americans, they can still be counted as adding to the diversity of a Historically Black College.

Panelists Comments on HBCU Leadership

In the study, panelist offered statements on HBCU leadership. While not emerging as a theme, some individual panelists made provocative comments shared here and commented upon in Chapter V. For example, a panelist suggested that leadership and trustee management of the HBCUs was not robust. Several panelist commented on leadership, governance and state oversight. Their comments are listed below.

I have very low regard for the board of trustees at HBCUs generally. There is a way that things should be handled. The administrators and trustees do not deal with things effectively, making us a public laughing stock. At the end of the day, nothing seems to be ever decided to help the institutions move forward. HBCU leaders do not maintain the dignity of the institution or legacy.

The job is so much more than the superficial. I don't see the kind of commitment and knowledge required to run institutions. Many of the people leading our colleges don't understand that the perception of their leadership is different than the perception of their white counterparts. Our stagnation is due to poor leadership.

The state has been neutral in terms of enforcing the governor's decree about how the trustees should be chosen. Someone nominates a person to the board and the governor agrees to the appointment. The university appears to be of no consequence because they have PWIs.

These panelist comments suggest there were experiences with leadership that were less than positive and should be considered when evaluating the effectiveness of leadership's ability to affect change at HBCUs.

Summary

In this chapter the data collected were analyzed with a view to reach a consensus. While a small sample was collected, the data provided a unique opportunity to examine elements of concern on varying HBCU campuses. Poor leadership remains a pressing issue, which was mentioned by several expert panelists; however, the one area of overriding consensus was that leaders of HBCUs should seek parity within the state system for their institutions. Other themes emerged such as using internationalization as a focus for desegregation and leadership and governance.

Some respondents were less than satisfied with leadership and board of trustees. Additionally, while agreement was reached regarding the highest priority there was also agreement in the area of the lowest priority. Panelists ranked focusing on recruitment of white students as the lowest priority and reached no level of agreement for focusing on desegregation in general.

Chapter V: Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendation

In this concluding Chapter, I discuss findings of the study. Although a small sample, it was sufficient to extract useable data. Further, I discuss the statement of the problem, recommendations, desegregation, emerging themes and suggestions for future research.

A consensus regarding priorities was reached on one question. Due to the competing agendas and priorities of HBCUs in the 21st century and the mandated desegregation, they are in a unique place, not experienced in earlier decades. While historically these colleges have not had financial support equal to predominately white institutions, they have also not faced a mandate to accept non-black students in order to receive funding and resources.

Re-statement of the Research Question

The research questions were stated as follows: Question One: Does the *Fordice* decision and the inferences of Interest Convergence prevent HBCUs from becoming a cohort of viable institutions and relegate them to a position where they continue to struggle and justify their existence? Question Two: Can leadership of HBCUs be re-framed for sustainability in the 21st century?

In response to Question One, the data suggests that interest convergence and the *Fordice* decision have had a widely negative impact on HBCUs widely. From the responses of the expert panelists, desegregation affects these institutions in negative ways. As stated in Chapter II, much like the *Brown* decision, the remedies suggested in *Fordice* appear to harm the intended beneficiaries. The reason for the Ayers lawsuit was to remove inequitable policies that fueled the dual system of higher education. The resulting effects are benefitting white students and PWI institutions.

Themes emerging from Rounds One and Two were consistent with research regarding *Fordice* and the desegregation of HBCUs (Gasman & Hilton, 2012; Minor, 2005). In particular there was resistance to the primary focus of the *Fordice* decision and remedies focusing on desegregation. Some panelists stated that because of the need to increase non-black enrollment, standards have been lowered to accommodate students who were unable to attend PWIs as a first choice. Those students in some ways are recruited by HBCUs for either sports teams or as students for whom HBCUs would otherwise be a distant choice with guaranteed funding and scholarships. One panelist suggested that some of the White admits are non-traditional students who utilize the graduate programs as a means of professional development in the fields of education, business or public sector. Another stated that PWIs are more competitive and many of the HBCU non-black students choose these institutions because of the open enrollment. While white students have other PWI options, financial incentives are attached to attending an HBCU, which makes them a viable choice.

According to the study, the response to Question Two suggests concerns regarding leadership of HBCUs such as: leadership should be focused on important issues that make HBCUs sustainable; leadership should understand that their image in the academy is not favorable and they are treated differently than PWI leaders and that leadership should be more decisive about strategies to move forward. There could however be challenges to achieving desegregation. A potential resistor could be leadership of an HBCU may not buy into the reasons for desegregation as established by *Fordice*. Indeed some challenge that HBCUs should receive funding in their own right without strategizing how to entice white students to attend in order to receive institutional funding. As stated in Chapter Two, O'Brien (1999) posited that awarding

funding to black institutions to entice white students privileges whites and discriminates against blacks. Black colleges are the survivors of discriminatory effects of state-enforced segregation.

The agenda established by the *Fordice* decision can conflict with administrators and faculty, which will bring resistance to change and prevent institutional forward movement. Without a consensus regarding the need for diversity, and an understanding of how the diversity will be implemented, it is unlikely that diversity initiatives at HBCUs will be successful. While this is a *case-by-case* scenario, resistance to change will need to be addressed. One panelist stated that resistance to change was not an option because of a mandate by leadership.

It [desegregation] has become an enrollment metric and has been articulated by our president and our trustees. Any of our state institutions that meet certain criteria diversifying their student bodies will receive funding. There is an existing formula. The doors have always been open. We've never had a closed admissions practice and have become more intentional but it has been a development of a recruitment strategy. This is a new conversation. There are limited resistors as what has helped us is the leadership has articulated expectations.

A challenge for leadership regarding desegregation to consider is aligning their personal interests with that of the college's state or federal mandates. The college represented by the panelist has outlined that desegregation is an expectation and has articulated it to the institution's administrators.

Observations Regarding Leadership

In response to Question Two of the study regarding reframing leadership, panelists volunteered their observations on leadership and suggested that leadership should focus on areas that would make them sustainable. While leadership's challenges were reflected in the study it did not emerge as a consistent theme or priority to be addressed through the Delphi process. Indeed the experts highlighted the following regarding HBCU leadership:

Question 2: How might institutional leadership affect desegregation?

- Insist on equality within the state system between PWIs and HBCUs.
- Do a better job of financial management and governance and increase partnerships with Community Colleges.

Question 3: What are the major challenges facing HBCUs regarding desegregation legislation, funding and policy changes?

- Having leadership that is focused on what will make us sustainable.

In addition, comments were mentioned in Chapter IV regarding lack of preparedness of leaders and board members or lack of governance at the state level. HBCU leaders are faced with external challenges such as new government regulations, mandates and regulatory monitoring for which some may not be prepared due to inequities in their training and preparation for their roles.

Newkirk (2012) suggests that weak governing boards are a typical challenge for HBCUs. Because of the reasons for their founding, HBCUs sustainability was dependent on philanthropy and charity. As stated in Chapter Two HBCUs were established to address the *Negro Problem* as well as create an industrial base for the New South. Steered by industrialist and charitable organizations, the direction of these institutions was shaped by those who deemed it necessary to address the nations' need to educate the freed slaves. As such governing bodies and board members were there to monitor campus life and social actions of students. They were in some ways an extension of old plantations where the owners put blacks in place to keep order within the ranks. Many board members lacked understanding about higher education as well.

“Unfortunately, these traits persist to the present. Hence HCBUs flounder aimlessly without guidance from the one body (board members) that is dedicated to their preservation” (Newkirk,

2012, p. 7). The positioning and establishment of these schools makes the comments by experts surprising because many of these institutions share similar issues regarding how they were established and future sustainability. All will face the challenges of a global economic down-turn and greater scrutiny regarding federal funding. Therefore, there was an expectation that as they shared concerns, similar comments would emerge. Understanding their beginnings, and some of the desegregation challenges which experts volunteered, it was interesting that better leadership and governance from board members was not more consistently suggested as a priority. There have been inferences of board selection being less than transparent. Two expert panelists offered experiences from their institutions suggesting that board membership is not vetted by the chairman or board members, but suggestions of friends and offer limitations in the areas of fundraising experience, knowledge of board leadership or political uplift in the area. Therefore, it was implied that the boards are ill-equipped to govern and lead.

Lovett's position further supports the notion of governance deficits in these colleges as he states

Some state desegregation plans integrated the institutional and state boards. However, minority board members and vice-versus white board members not always gained appointment because they had great leadership and fundraising abilities. Incompetent boards could strategically lead and institutions into the future, especially against a backdrop of personal bickering, egotism and political and religious intrigue. Some board members who were alumni interfered daily with on-campus operations and the internal decision-making processes. (Lovett, 2011, p. 304)

While the HBCU fulfilled a purpose of educating former slaves, the leadership of these institutions were relegated to continued dependency and their leadership's style of management was perceived to be authoritarian (Gasman, 2011; Newkirk, 2012). It appears these colleges were not intended to be more than holding places for Black citizens. HBCUs would train members of the Black community to be the leaders of other Black citizens. These colleges survived with less

than equal resources. In the 20th and 21st century however, this legacy, while laudable, is being questioned and a new paradigm is required. During their formative years, some HBCUs were led by white Presidents. It appears that Black presidents replaced the historical white leadership and assumed the paternalistic and authoritarian styles.

Phillips (2002) suggests that there remains a “chronic recycling of incompetent administrators that debilitates many HBCUs”. Unlike PWIs, the HBCUs constitute a very small percentage of higher education institutions. The untimely death due to mismanagement of one of these colleges will serve as a major set-back for the communities they serve.

Leadership challenges of HBCUs are steeped in controversy. As stated in Chapter II, HBCU leaders should have an awareness of political economic, moral and ethical drivers behind desegregation and leadership. Lovett (2011) suggests that the presidential and vice presidential candidates for HBCUs suffer from lack of good quality but meet the minimal qualifications for the positions of HBCU leadership. He further states

Without the ability of the administrative leadership to research, plan and carry out an effective strategy for institutional problems, some of the HBCUs could not forge an effective strategic plan. Without a sound vision, these institutions failed to attract large investors. They suffered program stagnation and deteriorating facilities. There were plenty of persons in line with doctorates; they had nice resumes however, they had lackluster training in real research methods, problem-solving, organizational experiences, human relations, people and leadership skills. They could not walk the walk and truly perform on the job. (p. 303)

For those who wish to remain contributors in the academy, new ways of existing are required. Nichols (2004) posits that HBCU presidents should be effective in federal and state government circles and ensure that policies are beneficial or not detrimental to their institutions. Understanding the resistors to desegregation and the costs of resistance to the institutions and communities they traditionally served is also paramount. Moving forward is essential for HBCUs as they are fighting for survival and battling unforeseen challenges of forced desegregation.

“CRT suggests that the voices of those who have been marginalized and subordinated provides a necessary dimension for this change process” (Love, 2004, p. 245).

Dissonance in Delphi Study

It was the intention of this study to shed light on areas of consensus within the HBCU system and to identify priorities. In addition it was hoped that this study would add to the canon regarding HBCU leadership as well. Consensus for priority was met in one area; however, the extreme level of disagreement was also enlightening in terms of prioritizing issues of importance for institutions to address. In this instance, the manner in which consensus was not met informed the study. Because of competing priorities and agendas, agreement could not be met in certain areas. Depending on state funding and issues of support for programs or duplicate offerings at PWIs some colleges have broader concerns regarding recruitment in general and retention, while others are concentrating on internationalization as a form of desegregation. External influences, institutional culture and double consciousness made reaching consensus in many areas unlikely as views were disparate and across the range of potential answers. Of this two-ness or double consciousness, Du Bois states

It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness, an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. (2007, p. 8)

Du Bois' (2007) theory of double consciousness advances the notion that Black people have a fractured identity as a result of oppression and the perception that they will always be “less than” as it has been ingrained for centuries that white is good and normative. Black is the opposite and therefore, while striving to re-identify oneself and approach one's place from a positive perspective, self doubt and questioning are originators of primary thinking in the black

culture. For some, seeking the approval and acceptance from the academy to be treated as equal and insisting on parity could be viewed as futile. The academy has not shown that HBCUs were intended to be equal, nor will they be in the future. By virtue of this discussion nearly 150 years after the thirteenth amendment was signed into law abolishing slavery in the United States of America, it is interesting that a new form of normalizing Blacks has plagued the system of higher education. Simply, the remedies of Fordice use whiteness as normative, by infusing resources and cash as incentives to desegregate.

Counter Narrative Approach

Using CRT as a lens, and methodologies of counter narratives, one recognizes that *Fordice* revisits the challenge of historical inequities and proposed remedies that penalize otherness by stripping them of their difference in order to be worthy of resources. The effects are highlighted through Du Bois (2007) theory of double consciousness and further through the remedies of the *Brown* decision and the intention to equalize funding and resources. Alternatives that could have been advanced are: repair crumbling schools in Black neighborhoods, provide equal teaching resources, offer trainings for teachers to remain current with educational trends and treat the schools as if their charge to educate black students was of equal value to educating white students. *Brown* however was subverted and became the anchor for white supremacy in education. The focus was on busing and forced integration rather than the simpler solution of providing equity to existing schools thus promoting free choice to America's citizens to attend any school as all would have been resourced equally.

As the precursor to *Fordice*, *Brown* lays a foundation that white is normative and separate educational facilities are unequal. Also, it suggests that black schools are inherently unequal to all white schools and if equity is to be achieved, black students have to be educated

with white students, for in their own right, they will not garner nor deserve the support to have equally supported educational provisions.

HBCU leadership has challenges to remain relevant in the white system called the academy while upholding their racial and cultural identity, which is perceived to be undervalued by the white majority. Some may feel that in becoming culturally competent and creating a university which is international and prepares students for a global economy dilutes the purpose of the HBCU. This concept could be considered segregationist and charged with racial bias except in this instance HBCUs have no power to withhold and therefore cannot be the progenitors of racism.

This cultural and racial two-ness could indeed contribute to the lack of agreement regarding priorities and leads to deeper issues regarding the struggle of cultural identity and the inherent conflicts of double consciousness. Since the remedies of *Fordice* are entrenched in incentives to achieve desegregation or whiteness the interpretation could be that the state's education department too believes in the redeeming power of whiteness. The argument that colleges will become better when standards are raised is irrefutable, however attaching desegregation to this premise becomes problematic. HBCUs therefore should demand equity in funding in their own right without attachment to forced desegregation.

The Future

Dialogue surrounding HBCUs is plagued with layers of circumstances and challenges that are embedded in racial history and politics; therefore the conversations are fraught with emotions and pitfalls. Can these schools meet the charge to educate underserved students by providing global and competitive educational opportunities? Are there means by which HBCUs can re-invent themselves to remain relevant to the American education system and prepare their

students for a global and interconnected society? I suggest that they can re-frame and must to survive. Some colleges have already begun to provide a global perspective to their education and use internationalization as their desegregation tools. Desegregation is being achieved by colleges creating unique programs for their institutions that attract international students. Kentucky State University's Aquaculture Engineering program for instance is attracting students wishing to study this discipline, which is not offered widely at other colleges in the area. The program is also attracting white domestic students as well as international students. Another areas of development to desegregate and re-frame HBCUs is partnering with business and industry such as health care while creating a niche' market providing specialized and technical training. This approach meets the needs of industry and attracts a diverse study body. It is essential for these institutions to re-frame to remain viable. In light of the Supreme Court's intention to revisit affirmative action decisions affecting college admissions policies, HBCUs could become a popular choice in the future if the Affirmative Action is repealed. As PWIs have fewer incentives to prioritize minority students for admissions, it becomes more significant to make HBCUs a more robust option. HBCUs have suffered from declining enrollment numbers to the point that over 75% of African Americans seeking a four year degree do so at PWIs. This trend could be reversed if Affirmative Action policies are changed. African American students who would have benefited from race-based preferences could face limited offers and therefore HBCUs could once again become options for those students. HBUCs could once again prove their importance to higher education in America. This statement does not align with Fryer and Greenstone's (2010) suggestion that HBCUs do not provide advantages to Black students and "on many dimensions and, by some measures, HBCU attendance appears to retard black progress" (p. 144). There are advantages to HBCUs adopting an aggressive plan for

sustainability that will dictate a radical change to their educational and leadership approaches. Their original purpose to educate Black students remains laudable and they have made significant contributions to American society. However, their visioning must be altered to accommodate the new mandates of desegregation.

For numerous reasons, HBCUs' leadership contends with the perception of inferiority. Most of these reasons began with a historic denial of equitable funding. This created and compounded institutional deficiencies such as inadequate physical structures and strain on the existing resources due to the high demands of their student body.

HBCUs have survived for over a century by utilizing strategies that best serve their communities. While not intentional, challenges to their sustainability such as *Fordice* and other court decisions have impeded their progress in some ways. Historically, there was great opposition from Southern citizens regarding educating the freed slave. Race relations had deteriorated in large part because of opposition of whites to programs they felt would elevate blacks at the expense of southern whites. These white citizens believed that social equity should not be an aspiration of blacks and that training them through education made them of "less material advantage to them" (Murty & Scipio, 2012, p. 105). These white citizens thought that industrial education would support the farming and new agricultural pursuits of the south. It seems clear that the implications of interest convergence has been a factor in the establishment of HBCUs which suggests scholars must challenge the presence of racism in policies intended to remedy racism, bias and inequity (Yosso, et al., 2004). It is also true that HBCUs were once greatly needed and as such fulfilled a service to humanity. Yet, without the ongoing support of both black and white citizens, the schools' prospects for longevity appear weak. In fact, it is important that the schools not act alone in trying to solve issues confronting them.

Integrative Summary

Utilizing a Critical Race Theory lens supported by colored positionality, which allowed the research to be viewed from a racialized lens to inform the study in useful and respectful ways, this study revealed that the HBCU past was one of difficult and not altruistic beginnings, however, through a series of struggles and triumphs, they have contributed to the landscape of higher education. Many policies have affected their existence as well as growth and sustainability. Aside from the desegregation orders of the *Fordice* decision to which they are all subjected, the newest Supreme Court rulings on Affirmative Action at colleges and universities, allows for state's rights yet again. In some states, we will no doubt see a significant decline in African American college enrollment in PWIs.

Noteworthy in this study is the level of disagreement within the panel, yet the area of agreement regarding points of least emphasis was desegregation. Their agreement speaks clearly to the focus the panelists believed their HBCUs should have. Leadership figured prominently in how panelists viewed the future of their institutions as well.

Recommendations for Future Studies

HBCUs have contributed to higher education and society in substantial ways. Their place in history is secure' however, their future may need to be re-framed in order to make them viable. The remedies of *Fordice* appear antebellum, as thriving HBCUs should be entitled to financial support without caveats. Penalizing these colleges for being separate or for existing as they were intended seems nonsensical. It is also unethical to allow the failing institutions to die slow deaths leaving underserved students in their path.

Future studies should examine opportunities for increasing international and other race students for the purpose of diversifying HBCUs and to afford African American students

opportunities to learn in a diverse and safe context. Murty and Scipio (2012) suggests that having a stronger presence in the global economy requires American higher education to prepare its students with knowledge in areas of cultural competence, political science and understanding of power bases of other nations and governments. We must equip our students with an understanding of a global and interconnected world. Therefore future studies could also include HBCUs having a heightened role in internationalization of American colleges demy.

A recent event causing current public discourse is the unprecedented financial gift of \$35 million donated to the University of Southern California by rapper, Dr. Dre. Because of historic underfunding and smaller endowments, HBCUs have historically had fewer financial resources to compete with their PWI counterparts. In addition, a smaller percentage of African American public figures are able to give significant financial gifts to colleges. Philanthropy to the arts or education by definition is an indicator of privilege. In the Black community post reconstruction and during slavery, knowledge and formal education was coveted. It was to be aspired to as it defined breeding, civic responsibility and social placement. Was this a strategic and genius maneuver on the part of Dr. Dre, or was it a vestige of being raised in Compton and feeling less than? Is this unneeded gift to one of the nation's wealthiest colleges from a member of one of the nation's most oppressed subcultures a sign of the new paradigm and a counter narrative to be advanced? Financial benevolence in America is a statement of white privilege. As mentioned at the beginning of this study, Slater, Carnegie and many other industrialists made their fortune on the work of the lower working classes and through their philanthropy, donated their fortunes to education and the arts, including the education of freed slaves. This is not dissimilar to Hip-Hop artists like Dr. Dre's making his fortune on the themes of oppression and disadvantage and the promotion of justice through violence in the Black community, particularly in South Central LA.

Hip-Hop artists embraced denigrating and powerful experiences while creating a counter narrative and sub-culture. This sub culture sought to reclaim oppressive thoughts and actions in a manner, which generated millions of dollars of revenue to the artists, but disenfranchised the communities who spent earnings from minimum wage jobs on the promise of empowerment. Is this a new trend? Are the Hip-Hop artists, (the group who assisted to embed the subculture of American poverty and disadvantage) the new leaders of philanthropic giving to the academy and perhaps the arts? These questions can potentially be explored in future studies.

An examination of the accusations of board mismanagement and selection would also be of use to future scholarship. If recycling inept board members and leaders plagues HBCUs then an exploration of different approaches for appointing trustees and finding administrators that are equipped, ethical and forward thinking is essential. HBCUs should seek to appoint outside their sphere of familiarity as the talent pool is shallow and some leadership of these colleges tend to leap-frog from one institution to the other taking bad practices and poor judgment with them. As stated in chapter three, some leaders are living in “psychic prisons because they cannot look at old problems in a new light and attack old challenges with different more powerful tools—they cannot reframe” (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 4).

Finally, there has been little scholarly discovery on non-Black leadership of HBCUs, in particular presidents. Internationalization of faculty and deans is commonplace; however, senior leadership remains primarily African American. Expanding the skill set of these potential leaders is essential. Also, conducting a wider search for HBCU leaders could be useful. While it would be a risky proposition, and there would no doubt be opposition, the talent pool of board members and senior leaders would be deeper and potential members may possess a different set of management tools. The empowerment of Black leaders is necessary and helps HBCUs show

‘in-race’ leadership to its students, staff and faculty; however, poor leadership is without race as is successful leadership. Results-driven leaders who embrace the tenets of an HBCU and promote the successful education of its primary constituents is important. Ethnicity alone cannot qualify a candidate for leadership of an HBCU when so much is at stake. It is time to re-frame the approach to leadership selection and criteria.

Future of HBCUs

Aside from mandated segregation of HBCUs the normal challenges to higher education in the 21st century are monumental. HBCUs have a variety of strengths and areas for further development. Some institutions have embraced the global business perspective as a method of both improving student enrollment and retention as well as providing a more diverse and international context from which students can learn. Other opportunities for expansion and re-inventing the traditional majors and degrees have moved several of these institutions into the foreground of innovation.

Major restructuring of HBCU administration and provincial attitudes regarding leadership are being challenged on a national stage. Consequences of poor leadership have become more visible in the academy as the economic down-turn both propelled more non-traditional students to seek education and caused a strain on existing limited funding.

The burden of desegregation in higher education has become the responsibility of institutions that were established to be separate and unequal. This legacy continues as even the most well-resourced HBCU cannot compete financially with the top tier PWIs. An example is Spelman College, which is rated as the number one HBCU in the nation, however, in this ranking, it is compared to other HBCUs which are less well resourced. According to US News College Rankings, the number one ranked liberal arts institution is Williams College, which

celebrates an endowment of \$1,755,417,770 in comparison to Spelman College, which is nationally ranked number 68 with an endowment of \$326,958,910. The disparity is staggering, yet, both are ranked nationally and separately. While some HBCUs such as Spelman, Howard, Tuskegee and Xavier are well known private colleges that produce high performing graduates, other HBCUs are at the lowest level of resources, graduation rates and experience high levels of attrition.

Re-framing will involve re-visiting the mission of individual colleges and highlighting successes. Visionary leadership alone will not produce the required results. HBCUs already have vision, what is missing are meaningful ways of articulating vision and proactive measures to achieve them.

In a report by Phillip Clay (2012) HBCUs Facing the Future, A Fresh Look at Challenges and Opportunities, he gathered information from leadership of HBCUs, campus visits and reviewed documents and data. In his recommendations, he suggested areas of improvement and focus for HBCUs in the future of which restating mission, changing enrollment strategy to attract stronger students, addressing less prepared students, and creating new majors which enhance the local economy and opportunities figured prominently. While many of these suggestions are sound, the presence of the *Fordice* remedies will either impede or assist institutions. Their success or failure will depend on their strength and development in these areas as well as their stability and ability to endure dissonance creating growth. The essential piece missing from the recommendations is the focus on desegregation. Without context, one can view all suggestions for improvements as useful. Mandated desegregation used as a carrot to achieve equitable resources creates further barriers to HBCUs addressing the needs of Black or African American students, faculty and communities. It also further changes their primary focus to the recruitment

and retention of non-Black students. This places the institutions in a situation where they can grow and achieve while leaving behind the students for which they were founded.

It continues to be my view that larger and broader conversations should occur. Leaders of HBCUs are required to begin conversations minimizing victimization and highlighting their institutions added value to the academy. Continuing to address HBCUs separately instead of treating them equally on all levels provides a disservice to its constituents. Looking to HBCU leadership to change their approach is useful, however, changes to the system of higher education and removing HBCUs from the bottom rung or placing them on a different ladder of higher education will be essential.

Many leaders of HBCUs have challenged the Department of Education and by default the White House because of perceived lack of support for these colleges. Changes in policies for student financial aid has adversely affected enrollment of many HBCUs. The most controversial is the changes in eligibility standards for Parent PLUS loans, which can be viewed as institutionally racist. Simply, the most stringent standards are being applied to one of America's most economically depressed groups thus limiting educational opportunities for the African American community. In addition there has been a reduction in federal funding for research, which will have lasting impacts on recruitment of faculty as high performing colleges are unexpectedly hemorrhaging funding. Is this a form of educational culling?

Leadership of HBCUs will need to be more forward in their requests for equity and be responsible stewards of increased funding and resourced. Committing institutional acts of bias unknowingly does not minimize effects. Equity in approach is essential, without which, many of these colleges will not survive.

Reflections and Summary

This final chapter presented discussion, recommendations and conclusions regarding the effects of desegregation and leadership of Historically Black Colleges and Universities in the United States. Viewing the scholarship from the lens of Critical Race Theory has been a dissonance creating experience. While there are reason that HBCUs should exist and their sustainability should be unquestioned, the reality is that in some ways they are unable to compete within a set of standards which they did not create. They are being compared to the norm, which is not black, therefore their underprivileged status keeps them in a position of catching up with others. This is unacceptable when educating young minds and giving African American collegians the best education for competition in a global economy, one must have all tools required.

There is discussion regarding how these colleges are serving their intended communities as well as sustaining themselves in the 21st century. In light of the remedies outlined in the *Fordice* decision, the challenges to these colleges are unusual, significant and impact enrollment. As the Supreme Court revisits whether affirmative action addresses issues of inequity in the education system and whether it violates the equal-protection clause of the constitution, HBCUs may experience newly found popularity. However, a more finessed approach to diversity and social justice could be attached to existing mandates regarding race-based preferences. It is possible to reverse the accomplishments made relating to African Americans attending elite institutions if Affirmative Action is not in place. Through these actions we will re-visit the Myth of Meritocracy, which has historically been the invisible barrier erected when the majority systematically withholds opportunities from minorities.

As the Supreme Court agreed to re-visit and offer opinions on race-conscious admissions policies in the state of Michigan and Texas there will be continued discourse in this area. There are some who believe that race-based admissions equalizes opportunities for non white students to attend PWIs. Should the case be overturned, HBCUs will ideally absorb the black collegians who are unable to attend PWIs because of unfavorable admissions policies and enjoy newfound popularity and higher numbers of black students.

Regarding the future of HBCUs, re-framing and in some ways establishing a new identity will be essential. Scholarship addresses deficits of HBCU leaders, however, finding solutions to potential leadership problems is essential to their sustainability. Resisters to change in relation to desegregation seem to be less stringent when recruiting international students than focusing on recruiting white students.

Interest convergence plays a significant part in desegregation policies. White colleges have always been exclusive either through admissions standards, gender or racial segregation. HBCUs have traditionally not, however; applying desegregation guidelines and policies to both PWIs and HBCUs threatens the purpose of HBCUs yet does not affect PWIs negatively.

The terrain continues to change in higher education and the external factors affecting HBCUs are significant. Desegregation and the potential repeal of race-based admissions to colleges can both affect HBCUs in monumental ways. Employing effective leadership strategies will be essential to establish a road map for HBCUs to make difficult decision regarding their uncertain future. Some will need to re-evaluate their organization's core values, vision statements and goals and undertake the difficult process of reinvention. While HBCUs have contributed to the topography of Higher Education and society, their sustainability remains precarious. Those that are successful will need to re-frame!

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Information Shared with Participants During Round I via Telephone

You have been invited to participate in a research study conducted by Armenta Hinton (doctoral candidate). The role that you currently hold at your institution positions you to have experiences with student populations and/or changes in policies regarding either student recruitment or desegregation. It is my hope that this study will reveal trends in higher education at HBCUs. It is also hoped that a consensus will emerge from this study that will inform the current scholarship in the area of HBCU leadership and sustainability and will contribute to future strategies intended to assist in the development of HBCUs in the 21st century

For the purpose of this study, I am using the Delphi technique, which solicits answers to the following open-ended questions:

- What, if anything, should HBCUs do to encourage desegregation?
- How might institutional leadership affect desegregation?
- What are the major challenges facing HBCUs regarding desegregation legislation, funding and policy changes?

Thank you for your participation.

Armenta Hinton

APPENDIX B

Letter Sent to Panelist via Email for Round II

March 22, 2013

Dear Panelist,

Thank you for participating in this study for my dissertation. As I mentioned in our earlier conversation, the role that you currently hold at your institution positions you to have experiences with student populations and/or changes in policies regarding either student recruitment or desegregation. It is my hope that this study will reveal trends in higher education at HBCUs. It is also hoped that a consensus will emerge from this study that will inform the current scholarship in the area of HBCU leadership and sustainability and will contribute to future strategies intended to assist in the development of HBCUs in the 21st century.

For the purpose of this study, I am using the Delphi technique, which solicits answers to the following open-ended questions:

- What, if anything, should HBCUs do to encourage desegregation?
- How might institutional leadership affect desegregation?
- What are the major challenges facing HBCUs regarding desegregation legislation, funding and policy changes?

From the first round of answers, (without identifying institutions or responder) I have compiled the comments and answers into a list of responses to the questions. Hopefully, I have captured the essence of your comments.

Please take a moment to review these answers and, stimulated by what others have said, add any additional thoughts that you feel will address the questions as they relate to your institution. Please email this document to me via return email: ahinton@antioch.edu by Friday, March 29, 2013.

I sincerely appreciate the time that you have graciously extended to me, and hope that this study will add to the canon of leadership scholarship.

Yours sincerely,

Armenta Hinton, Ph.D. (candidate)
Antioch University
Leadership and Change Program

1. Question: What, if anything, should HBCUs do to encourage desegregation?

Desegregation should not be the priority.

Hire a non-black recruiter to appeal to other-race students.

Focus on enrollment in general.

Recruit in places that will yield non-black students.

Recruit mostly white and non-black students.

Re-vamp admissions materials to be more reflective of a multi-cultural student body.

Create an international students services department.

What else?

2. How might institutional leadership affect desegregation?

Dictate that the institution should meet certain criteria in diversifying their student body

Earmark funding for non-black students.

Insist on equality within the state system between PWIs and HBCUs.

Do a better job of financial management and governance.

Encourage international recruitment.

What else?

3. What are the major challenges facing HBCUs regarding desegregation legislation, funding and policy changes?

Having leadership that is focused on what will make us sustainable.

Reducing inequity in funding as compared to PWIs.

Competing with duplicate programs from neighboring Predominately White Institutions.

Making our college appealing to white students.

Maintaining accreditation.

Increasing enrollment overall.

Maintaining fiscal solvency.

Maintaining academic standards while also having an open admission policy.

What else?

APPENDIX C

Letter Sent to Panelist via Email for Round III

April 2, 2013

Dear Panelist,

Thank you again for your continued participation in this study for my dissertation. This is the third and hopefully the final round, as the purpose is to seek consensus. You are one of nine participants that have been involved in this study representing HBCUs from a wide geographic sampling. Additionally, I have been able to compose a group of senior ranking members of the academy and its administration. As I mentioned in our earlier conversation, the role that you currently hold at your institution positions you to have experiences with student populations and/or changes in policies regarding either student recruitment or desegregation. It is my continued hope that this study will reveal trends in higher education at HBCUs. It is also hoped that a consensus will emerge from this study that will inform the current scholarship in the area of HBCU leadership and sustainability and will contribute to future strategies intended to assist in the development of HBCUs in the 21st century.

Using the Delphi method, I composed a list of responses from our first round introductory communication. The second round which was sent two weeks prior identified all of the responses with the intention to solicit additional thoughts from the participants. Some panelists had no further comments; others contributed additional ideas.

The questions to which you responded during the first two rounds were:

- What, if anything, should HBCUs do to encourage desegregation?
- How might institutional leadership affect desegregation?
- What are the major challenges facing HBCUs regarding desegregation legislation, funding and policy changes?

For this final round, please rank the responses in order of importance to your organization.

Assign “1” to the item you believe to be most important, “2” to the one next most important, and so on, until you have rank-ordered all items. Please return the form by Monday, April 8, 2013 by return email. I will be making follow-up phone calls to make sure that you have received this last round and clarify if you have any questions.

I sincerely appreciate the time that you have graciously extended to me, and hope that this study will add to the canon of leadership scholarship.

Yours sincerely,
Armenta Hinton, Ph.D. (candidate)
Antioch University

1. What, if anything, should HBCUs do to encourage desegregation?

	Rank
Desegregation should not be the priority.	
Hire a non-black recruiter to appeal to other-race students.	
Focus on enrollment in general.	
Recruit in places that will yield non-black students.	
Recruit mostly white and non-black students.	
Re-vamp admissions materials to be more reflective of a multi-cultural student body.	
Create an international students services department.	
Focus on integrating graduate programs, distance learning or adult learning programs if they exist.	
Have programs that make them unique and that will attract white students.	

2. How might institutional leadership affect desegregation?

	Rank
Dictate that the institution should meet certain criteria in diversifying its student body.	
Earmark funding for non-black students.	
Insist on equality within the state system between PWIs and HBCUs.	
Do a better job of financial management and governance.	
Encourage international recruitment.	
Increase partnerships with community colleges or other two-year degree granting institutions.	
Encourage international partnerships.	
Increase partnerships with local business to raise profile.	

3. What are the major challenges facing HBCUs regarding desegregation legislation, funding and policy changes?

	Rank
Having leadership that is focused on what will make us sustainable.	
Reducing inequity in funding as compared to PWIs.	
Competing with duplicate programs from neighboring Predominately White Institutions.	
Making our college appealing to white students.	
Maintaining accreditation.	
Increasing enrollment overall.	
Maintaining fiscal solvency.	
Maintaining academic standards while also having an open admission policy.	

APPENDIX D

Thank you Letter for Panelist Participation

Dear Panelist,

Thank you for participating in this study for my doctoral dissertation. I have a unique understanding of the challenges that you face and the competing priorities on your roles within the academy. Your willingness to assist me to conduct this study and your encouragement was greatly appreciated.

No surprise, reaching a consensus in terms of priorities was difficult. As a matter of fact the dissension among the responses for prioritizing desegregation was astounding. However, an overwhelming consensus was reached on one item, which was insisting on equality within the state systems.

I am completing the dissertation process and would be happy to send you the synopsis of the study once approved by my committee.

Please feel free to call upon me if I can ever be of assistance to you in any way.

Yours sincerely,

Armenta Hinton, Ph.D. (Candidate)
Antioch University

APPENDIX E

A Compilation of Round I Responses to HBCU Desegregation and Leadership

Resources are low. Students want better facilities like work out facilities, new dorms and residence halls, and when that cannot be provided it makes it hard to sell the school. Probably in the early and mid 90's we peaked in enrollment. The university is trying to re-invent themselves to be more viable. It's tough when you don't receive large amounts of funding. We don't have a large alumni data base. We have many challenges around the board. I would contend that most of the feedback has been that there is little confidence in our board of directors.

There are no challenges to desegregation because the school is facing low enrollment and other financial challenges.

The university has a low percentage of minorities (white students). I have seen the trend from the state junior colleges transferring students into our school. Prior to that, white students were looking at HBCUs because of the scholarship. Also tennis, kickers and punters on the football team, golf or soccer were the teams white students are recruited for by athletics and then they want to major in business. We get quite a few students the majority that we get come through that route. Also the Masters in Accountancy program classes are at night, and because of our being near the capitol, we attract governmental employees looking for MS degrees in business. The baseball team is mostly minority and non-black.

We have made a conscious decision to widen the international footprint. Our leadership

coordinated an international recruiting strategy. Countries we are focusing on are China, Africa, and the Bahamas. The university's leadership has made a conscious decision to appeal to the international community. Recruiting has been more intentional. It has been especially more significant in the college of business so that the students will graduate with Entrepreneurship and International Business. We have been able to send many of our professors on the governors trade mission.

Duplication of programs is a problem. Knight v Alabama indicated that the PWI in our area would not build dorms, but what is happening is that they now have dorms. The Alabama Association of Colleges and Universities once requested that we send in a request to start programs. One of the reasons for the oversight was that they wanted to avoid duplication in nearby colleges. Now, location is not the determining factor so that other PWIs could in fact duplicate the programs freely and eventually take over our programs.

The state has been neutral in terms of enforcing the governor's decree about how the trustees should be chosen. Someone nominates a person to the board and the governor agrees to the appointment. The university appears to be of no consequence because they have PWIs. In our state, the Governor is the President of all state boards. We have always been a teachers college. One of our most vocal past trustees was a politico. However, we can't seem to use our influence effectively. A major car manufacturer is in our city and gave only \$2,500 for homecoming. They however gave tens of thousands to the PWI. We do not get support from corporate world at this point, but from people that we do business with.

A lot of our desegregation is a result of in-state students that attend our college.

Leadership is essential to this messaging and to our state in order for us to be competitive. The leadership is saying for the past 3 to 4 years we need to be seen as liberal arts, land grants and an HBCU. The agricultural program is world-renowned and is a great marketing tool. The product is comparable to other colleges. We target Asian Countries for recruitment.

HBCUs should have more Study Abroad Programs. International students are coming to the US one way or the other.

I have seen more non-black students. We are still mostly an HBCU. It was mentioned about a year ago that the university needed to diversify its faculty. We have really just had a large turnover of new faculty and staff. They are adapting to the HBCU standard. The administrators are not from southern universities they are from northern and western US colleges.

The namesake of HBCUs has been paralleled with substandard and not as good. That's the impression that students in high schools get. So even when I came through high school, everyone was going to the big state school. But when I graduated and went into the workforce, I realized the stigma attached to HBCUs was un-deserved. After attending a flagship white school for undergraduate studies, I attended HBCUs for graduate school including *Meharry*. The HBCU experience suited me and was more empowering.

If you continue to take students lower achieving students that cannot get into other colleges, your

standards will be lowered. The ones that don't have scholarships are lower achievers.

Desegregation is more noticeable in our nursing program as most of the nursing students are white. Leadership has only told of the need to diversify faculty without reason or motivation.

White students are attending our college for athletic opportunities in baseball, softball, volleyball and football. Also, there are a small percentage of students who attend because they are unable to get into other colleges. This college has open admissions so unprepared students can enter the college by taking development courses which are available to bring students up to college level. We have some international students. In the 70's there were many more from the US Virgin Island and Haiti. Some white students are integrating well because they are pledging sororities and fraternities. The total student non-black population is low. Many do not persist.

Students choose HBCUs because of family traditions or the open door admissions enrollment.

Also they choose HBCUs because of their historical significance. HBCUs are expensive and do not have large endowments or donors to generate scholarships.

We are working towards becoming a graduate university. The goals are to increase the number of graduates in 2020, we are looking at how we will have to retain students and increase retention levels.

Our school was founded because the land grant funding, however it does not receive equitable funding. The closest PWI received funding at a rate of \$4.00 to our \$1.00.

Undergrads have been black but grad programs have been white. This is in part because of its graduate programs focus on education. In the 90's we had an influx of white students.

I don't believe that there has been a mandate regarding desegregation, it is implied. The college has always been open to all students. Not all students have come in large numbers. This is true of faculty and staff as well. We have one of the most diverse faculty of all of the institutions in the state. We have always recruited at places that would have been predominately white. The only difference now is that there are designated dollars earmarked for white students now that was not available before.

If you look at the mission and purpose of the college, it states that we focus on the students who may have deficiencies based on their prior educational systems. This does not exclude us from creating more policies to include everyone. I don't see it as diluting the mission. There is a need for HBCUs and as we open our doors, we must not forget those students that need to have that extra attention to those who don't have high ACT but those who will benefit from this education. This can be a problem for schools who are forced to take students with higher stats and exclude students with lower scores. In that realm, some may feel that they may be getting away from their mission as you loose a number of students that don't meet the criteria. As long as the minority students are not being left out, I think targeted desegregation is not a problem. My fear is that if we are not careful, the PWIs recruiting the high fliers based on test scores will also attract Black students leaving HBCUs to educate those with lower test scores. Although, test scores are not indicators of intellect nor whether the students will be able to succeed, some HBCUs may have to base admissions on these scores to be competitive.

Who is testing the model that HBCUs have in building students to where they need to be. We still suffer from high drop-out rate and higher levels of attrition. Unfortunately, I think what happens is that the leadership at our institutions don't have a clue. The job is so much more than the superficial. I don't see the kind of commitment and knowledge required to run institutions. Many of the people leading our colleges don't understand that the perception of their leadership is different than the perception of their white counterparts. Our stagnation has to do with leadership.

I have very low regard for the board of trustees at HBCUs generally. There is a way that things should be handled. The administrators and trustees do not deal with things effectively, making us a public laughing stock. At the end of the day, nothing seems to be ever decided to help the institutions move forward. HBCU leaders do not maintain the dignity of the institution or legacy. Is there a cover-up? These poorly handled situations put us in a more precarious position.

Leadership has dictated that the institution meets certain criterions in diversifying their student body and funding will be attached. It has become an enrollment metric and has been articulated by our president and our trustees. Any of our state schools institutions that meet certain criterions diversifying their student bodies will receive funding. There is an existing formula. The doors have always been open. We've never had a closed admissions practice and have

become more intentional but it has been a development of a recruitment strategy. This is a new conversation. There are limited resistors as what has helped us is that the leadership has articulated expectations

There have not been any robust strategic plans and wrap around services to support the students. We are visiting more non-black schools to recruit and participate in college fairs that are broad in terms of ethnic diversity. We are doing radio advertising. It (desegregation) is an expectation. The challenge for me as the director of Enrollment Management, is, I need to help people to understand how we message with limited resources. This may be a one to two year endeavor until we get some things implemented. Diversity enhances education. As demographics continue to change. There is an enrollment incentive.

We have one of the most diverse faculty that I have ever worked in. Why are we detracting from the important mission?

APPENDIX F**List of HBCU by State****Alabama****Four Year Public**

Alabama A & M University
Alabama State University

Four Year Private

Concordia College Selma
Miles College
Oakwood University
Selma University
Stillman College
Talladega College
Tuskegee University

Two-Year Public

Bishop State Community College
Shelton State Community
College, C.A. Fredd Campus
Gadsen State Community College, Valley Street
J.F. Drake State Technical College
Lawson State Community College
Trenholm State Technical College

Arkansas**Four-Year Public**

University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff

Four-Year Private

Arkansas Baptist College
Philander Smith College

Two-Year Private

Shorter College

Delaware

Four-Year Public

Delaware State University

District of Columbia**Four-Year Public**

University of the District of Columbia

Four-Year Private

Howard University

Florida**Four-Year Public**

Florida A&M University

Four-Year Private

Bethune-Cookman College

Edward Waters College

Florida Memorial University

Georgia**Four-Year Public**

Albany State University

Fort Valley State University

Savannah State University

Four-Year Private

Clark Atlanta University

Interdenominational Theological Center

Morehouse College

Morehouse School of Medicine

Morris Brown College

Paine College

Spelman College

Kentucky**Four-Year Public**

Kentucky State University

Louisiana**Four-Year Public**

Grambling State University

Southern University A&M College

Southern University at New Orleans
Dillard University of Louisiana
Xavier University

Two-Year Public

Southern University at Shreveport

Maryland

Four-Year Public

Bowie State University
Coppin State College
Morgan State University
University of Maryland Eastern Shore

Michigan

Two-Year Private
Lewis College of Business

Mississippi

Four-Year Public

Alcorn State University
Jackson State University
Mississippi Valley State University

Four-Year Private

Rust College
Tougaloo College

Two-Year Public

Coahoma Community College
Hinds Community College, Utica

Missouri

Four-Year Public

Harris-Stowe State University
Lincoln University

North Carolina

Four-Year Public

Elizabeth City State University
Fayetteville State University

North Carolina Central University
North Carolina A&T State University
Winston-Salem State University

Four-Year Private

Barber-Scotia College
Bennett College
Johnson C. Smith University
Livingstone College
Shaw University
St. Augustine's College

Ohio

Four-Year Public

Central State University

Four-Year Private

Wilberforce University

Oklahoma

Four-Year Public

Langston University

Pennsylvania

Four-Year Public

Cheyney University of Pennsylvania
Lincoln University

South Carolina

Four-Year Public

South Carolina State University

Four-Year Private

Allen University
Benedict College
Claflin University
Morris College
Voorhees College

Two-Year Public

Denmark Technical College

Two-Year Private

Clinton Junior College

Tennessee

Four-Year Public

Tennessee State University

Four-Year Private

Fisk University

Knoxville College

Lane College

Lemoyne-Owen College

Meharry Medical College

Texas

Four-Year Public

Prairie View A&M University

Texas Southern University

Four-Year Private

Huston-Tillotson University

Jarvis Christian College

Pau Quinn College

Southwestern Christian College

Texas College

Wiley College

Two-Year Public

St. Philips's College

Virginia

Four-Year Public

Norfolk State University

Virginia State University

Four-Year Private

Hampton University

Saint Paul's college

Virginia Union University

Virginia University of Lynchburg

West Virginia**Four-Year Public**

Bluefield State College

West Virginia State University

U.S. Virgin Islands

University of the Virgin Islands

References

- Adams v. Richardson, 480 F. 2d 1159 (1973).
- Adler, M., & Ziglio, E., (1996). *Gazing into the oracle: The Delphi method and its application to social policy and public health*. London, England: Jessica Kingsley.
- Alexander, M. 2012. *The new Jim Crow*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Allen, K., Bordas, J., Hickman, G. R., Matusak, L., Sorenson, G., & Whitmire, K. (1998). *Leadership in the 21st Century*. Los Angeles, CA: Academy of Leadership Press.
- Allen, W., Jayakumar, U., Griffin, K., Korn, W., & Hurtado, S. (2005). *Black undergraduates from Bakke to Grutter: Freshen status, trends and prospects, 1971-2004*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California.
- Allen, W., & Jewell, J. O. (1995). African American education since an American dilemma: An American Dilemma revisited. *Daedalus*, 124(1), 77–100.
- Amey, M. J. (2006). Leadership in higher education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 38, 55-58.
- Baldwin, W. H., Jr. (1899). The present problem of negro education: The social question. *Journal of Social Science*. 37, 52.
- Bass, B., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 181-217.
- Batts, V. (2001). *Is reconciliation possible? Lessons from combating "Modern Racism."* Retrieved from <http://visions-inc.org/article/is-reconciliation-possible-lessons-from-combating-modern-racism/>
- Bell, D. (1987). *And we are not saved: Elusive quest for racial justice*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bell, D. (2005). Racial realism. In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *The Derrick Bell reader*. (pp. 55-96). New York, NY: NYU Press.
- Bergsieker, H., Shelton, N., & Richeson, J. (2010). To be liked versus respected: divergent goals in interracial interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 99(2), 248-264.
- Blaustein, A. P., & Zangrando, R. L. (1991). *Civil rights and African Americans*. Evanston, IL: Simon and Schuster.
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1991). *Reframing organizations, artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (2003). *Reframing organizations, artistry, choice and leadership*. (4th Ed.) San Francisco, CA: Wiley and Sons.
- Booyesen, L., Kelly C., Nkomo, S., & Steyn, M. (2007). Rethinking the diversity paradigm: South African practices. *The International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communications & Nations*, 7(4), 3.
- Bowen, W. G., Kurzweil, M.A., & Tobin, E. M. (2005). *Equity and excellence in American Higher Education*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Brown, K. (2005). Race, law and education in the post-desegregation. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Brown II, M. C. (2001). Collegiate desegregation and the public Black college: A new policy mandate. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72, 46–62.
- Brown II, M.C., & Ricard, R. B. (2007). The honorable past and uncertain future of the nation's HBCUs. *The NEA Higher Education Journal*, 117-130.
- Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.W. 483 (1954).
- Bureau of the Census. (1975). *U.S. Department of Commerce, Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970*. (Historical statistics of the United States). Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Burns, J. M. (2004). *Transforming leadership: A new pursuit of happiness*. New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Byrd-Cichester, J. (2000). The federal courts and claims of racial discrimination in higher education. *The Journal of Negro Education*. 69(12), 12–26.
- Census: Minority population rose in GA last decade. *Atlanta Business Chronicle* (3/17/2011) Accessed from: www.bizjournals.com/atlanta/news/2011/03/17/census-minority-population-rose-in.html
- Clay, P.L. (2012). *Historically black colleges and universities facing the future. A fresh look at challenges and opportunities*. Retrieved from: www.fordfoundation.org/advancinghigher-education-access-and-success.
- Clayton, M. J. (1997). Delphi: A technique to harness expert opinion for critical decision-making tasks in education. *Educational Psychology*, 17(4), 373-384.

- Clayton-Pedersen, A., Parker, S., Smith, D., Moreno, J., & Teraguchi, D. (2009). *Making a real difference with diversity: A guide to institutional change*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Cuilla, J. B., (1995). Leadership ethics: Mapping the territory. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 5(1), 5-25.
- Dalkey, N. C. (1972). *The Delphi method: An experimental study of group opinion*. In N. C. Dalkey, D. L., Rourke, R. Lewis, & D. Synder (Eds.), *Studies in the quality of life: Delphi and decision-making* (pp. 55-83). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Delbecq, A. L., Van de Ven, A. H., & Gustafson, D. H. (1975). *Group techniques for program planning*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Dixon, A., & Rousseau, C. (2005). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory in education ten years later. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 7-27.
- Driver, J. (2011). Rethinking the interest convergence thesis. *Northwestern University Law Review*. 105(1), 149-197.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (2007). *The Souls of Black folk*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Eckel, P., & Kezar, A. (2003). *Taking the reins: Institutional transformation in higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: ACE-ORYX Press.
- Ely, R., Thomas, D. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229-273.
- Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory*. London, England: SAGE.
- Evans, A. L., Evans, V., & Evans, A.M. (2002). Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). *Education*, 123(1), 3-16.
- Fleming, J. (1984). *Blacks in college: A comparative study of students' success in Black and in White institutions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Freeman, K. (2004). *Black colleges: New perspectives on policy and practice*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Fryer, R. G., & Greenstone, M. (2010) The changing consequences of attending historically black colleges and universities. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*. 2(1), 116-148.

- Gasman, M. (2011, May-June). How to paint a better portrait of HBCUs. *The American Association of University Professors, The academe*.
- Gasman, M., Baez, B., & Turner, C. (2008). *Understanding minority-serving institutions*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Gasman, M., & Hilton, A. (2012). Mixed motivations, mixed results: A history of law legislation, historically black colleges and universities and interest convergence. *Teachers College Record*, 114(7) 1-20.
- Gilgun, J. (2010). Reflexivity and qualitative research. *Current Issues in Qualitative Research*. 1(2). Retrieved from: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/35787948/Reflexivity-and-Qualitative-Research>.
- Gordon, T. J. (1994). *The Delphi method*. Washington, DC: American Council for the United Nations University.
- Gregory, S. T. (2003). *Negotiating culture: Faculty roles and responsibilities in HBCU*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association Chicago, IL.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*. 7(3), 330-366.
- Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, 106, 1707-1779.
- Harvey, W. B., & Anderson, E. L. (2005). *Minorities in higher education 2003–2004: Twenty first annual status report*, American Council on Education, Washington, DC.
- Hasson, F., Keeney, S., & McKenna, H. (2000). Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 32 (4), 1008-1015.
- Hebel, S. (2004). Supreme Court clears way for settlement of college-desegregation case. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 26.
- Hill, S. T. (1983). The traditionally black institutions of higher education, 1860-1982. U.S. Department of Education, *National Center for Education Statistics*, xii-xix.
- Historically Black colleges and universities rankings*. U.S. News and World Report College Rankings 2011. Retrieved from colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges/rankings/hbcu
- Hogarth, R. M. (1978). A note on aggregating opinions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 21, 40-46.
- Hsu, C. C., & Sandford, B. (2007). The Delphi Technique: Making sense of consensus. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, 12(10), 1-8.

- Jackson-Leslie, L. (2001). Race, sex, and meritocracy. *The Black Scholar*, 25(3), 24-29.
- Kezar, A. (n.d.). *Synthesis of scholarship on change in higher education*. Retrieved from mobilizingstem.wceruw.org
- Kezar, A. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century: Recent research and conceptualizations*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, 28(4), 1-147. Retrieved from: <http://www.questia.com/read/117451110/understanding-and-facilitating-organizational-change>
- Kezar, A. (2008). Understanding leadership strategies for addressing the politics of diversity. *Journal of Higher Education*, 79(4), 406-441.
- Kimbrough, W. (2013). Why USC and not a Black College, Dr. Dre? *Los Angeles Times* [Los Angeles]. Retrieved from <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/may/21/opinion/la-oe-kimbrough-usc-dre-20130521>
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-69.
- Love, B. J. (2004). Brown plus 50 counter-storytelling: A critical race theory analysis of the "majoritarian achievement gap" story. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 37, 277-246.
- Lovett, B. (2011). *American's historically black colleges & universities: A narrative history from the nineteenth century into the twenty-first century*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
- Lum, L. (2001). Will historic inequities ever be remedied? *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 18(3), 32-39.
- Macfarlane, B. (2009). *Researching with integrity: The ethics of academic enquiry*. London, England: Routledge.
- Mauthner, N., & Doucet, A. (2003). Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis. *Sociology*. Sage Publications, 37(3), 413-430.
- McMillian, J., & Wergin, J. (1998). *Understanding and evaluating educational research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Meyerson, D., & Scully, M. (1995). Tempered Radicalism: Changing the workplace from within. *Center for Gender in Organizations*, 6(50), 585-600.
- Meyerson, D. (2003). *Tempered radicals: How everyday leaders inspire change at work*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.

- Milner, H. R. (2007). Race, culture, and researcher positionality: Working through dangers seen, unseen, and unforeseen. *Educational Researcher*, 36(7), 388–400.
- Minor, J. T. (2005). Discerning facts about faculty governance at HBCUs. *The Academe*, 91(3), 34-38.
- Mitchell, V. W. (1991). The Delphi technique: An exposition and application. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 3(4), 333-358.
- Moynihan, D. P. (1965). *The Negro family: A case for national action*. Washington, DC: Office of Policy, Planning and Research, U.S. Department of Labor.
- Muhammad, C. G. (2009). Mississippi higher education desegregation and the interest convergence principle: A CRT analysis of the Ayers settlement. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 2(3), 319-336.
- Murty, M., & Scipio, J. (2012) Survival management becomes academic autocracy. In V. Newkirk (Ed.), *New life for historically black colleges and universities: A 21st century perspective* (pp. 97-119). Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Nichols, C. J. (2004). Unique characteristics, leadership styles, and management of historically black colleges and universities. *Innovative Higher Education*, 28(3), 219-229.
- Newkirk, V. R. (2012). *New life for historically black colleges and universities: A 21st century perspective*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Northouse, P. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- O'Brien, M. (1999). Discriminatory effects: Desegregation litigation in higher education in Georgia. *William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal*, 8, 1-51.
- Padilla, A., & Lindholm, K. (2001). Quantitative educational research with ethnic minorities. In *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (pp. 97-113). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Palmer, R., Davis, R., & Gasman, M., (2011). A matter of diversity, equity and necessity: The tension between Maryland's higher education system and its historically black colleges and universities over the office of civil rights agreement. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 2(80), 121-133.
- Pant, M. (2012, October 24). Wilberforce students threaten to leave school. *Dayton Daily News* [Dayton, OH]. Retrieved from <http://www.daytondailynews.com/news/news/wilberforce-students-threaten-to-leave-school/nSm6m/>

- Perna, L. W. (2001). The contribution of historically Black colleges and universities and preparation of African American faculty careers. *Research in Higher Education*, 42, 267-292.
- Plessy v. Ferguson (1896). 163 U.S. 537, 41 L. Ed. 256, 16 S. Ct. 1138.
- Pill, J. (1971). The Delphi method: Substance, context a critique and an annotated bibliography. *Socio-Economic Planning Science*, 5, 57-71.
- Phillips, I. P. (2002) Shared Governance on Black College Campuses. *Academe*, 88(4).
- Pope, J. (2009). Under a third of men at black colleges earn degree in 6 years. *USAToday*. Retrieved from: http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/education/2009-03-30-black-colleges_N.htm
- Powell, C. (2003). The Delphi technique: Myths and realities. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 4(41), 376-382.
- Pursley, G. (2003). Thinking diversity, rethinking race: Toward a transformative concept of diversity in higher education. *Texas Law Review*, 82(1), 153-99.
- Riley, J. (2010). Black colleges need a new mission. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704654004575517822124077834.html>
- Roebuck, J. B., & Murty, K. S. (1993). *Historically Black colleges and universities: Their place in American higher education*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Sendjaya, S. (2005). Morality and leadership: Examining the ethics of transformational leadership. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 3, 75-86.
- Stone, D., Patton, B., & Heen, S. (1999). *Difficult conversations: How to discuss what matters most*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Sum, P., Light, A., & King, R. (2004). Race, reform and desegregation in Mississippi higher education: Historically Black institutions after United States v. Fordice. *Law & Society Inquiry*, 29(2), 403-435.
- Tierney, W.G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 59(1), 2-21.
- Turoff, M., & Hiltz, S.R. (1996). Computer based Delphi process. In M. Adler & E. Ziglio (Eds.), *Gazing into the oracle: The Delphi method and its application to social policy and public health*, (pp. 56-88). London, England: Jessica Kingsley.
- Wagner, U., & Smith, E. (1993) Maintaining a competitive edge: Strategic planning for historically black institutions. *Change*, 25(1), 40-49.

- Warner, C. D. (1900). The higher education for the Negro. *Congregationalist* (1891-1901). *American Periodicals*, 719.
- Watkins, W. (2001). *The White architects of black education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Weaver, W. T. (1971). The Delphi forecasting method. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 52 (5), 267-273.
- Wenglinsky, H. (1997). *Students at historically black colleges and universities: Their aspirations and accomplishments*. Princeton, NJ: Policy Information Center, Educational Testing Service.
- Wergin, J. (2007). *Leadership in place: How academic professionals can find their leadership voice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Whitchurch, C. (2008). Shifting identities, blurring boundaries: The changing roles of professional managers in higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 64.
- Yancy, G. (2004). W.E.B. DuBois on whiteness and the pathology of black double consciousness. *APA Newsletter*, 4(1), 10-22.
- Young, J. (1999). *The exclusive society: Social exclusion, crime and difference in late modernity*. London, England: Sage.
- Yosso, T. J., Parker, L., Solórzano, D. G., & Lynn, M. (2004). From Jim Crow to affirmative action and back again: A critical race discussion of racialized rationales and access to higher education. *Review of Research in Education*, 28, 1–25.
- United States Commission on Civil Rights. (2010). *The educational effectiveness of historically black colleges and universities: A briefing before the United States Commission on Civil Rights*. Washington, DC: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2007). *Digest of education statistics*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- United States v. Fordice, 505 U.S. 717, 112 S.Ct. 2727 (1992).
- Witkin, B. R., & Altschuld, J. W. (1995). *Planning and conducting needs assessment: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.